

# CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

A MAGAZINE FOR A DEMOCRACY OF CONTENT

18

VOL. 5

**JUNE-JULY 1954**

THE CASE OF PUERTO RICO  
YEAR ONE OF THE EISENHOWER  
CRUSADE

Robert Keller

VIGNETTES OF AMERICAN LIBERTY

(II) The Right to Work

Martin Norris

BERLIN, 17th JUNE . . .

F. Lohenbill

THE PEACE CAMPAIGN

R. N. Petrov

THE SOCIETY FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY  
IN SCIENCE GROWING — NOT DYING :

(I) Rejoinder to P.M. by Victor Paschkis,  
Vice President of the S.S.R.S.

(II) Reply by P.M.

MATERIAL AND DOCUMENTS

America on the Road of Hitler and Stalin

CORRESPONDENCE

## CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

No. 17

Kenya under the Iron Heel	A. E. Ross
Pedro Albizu-Campos: a note to our Readers	
The Book Business in America	Alan Dutscher
Postscript to Genocide	Ralph Herman
The Campaign against Conscription in Britain	
Materials and Documents	
We Will Not Move	

---

For all who read German, we recommend our sister publication

### DINGE DER ZEIT

Contents of No. 15 recently published:

Berlin, 17. Juni	F. Lohenbill
Amerikas landwirtschaftliche Überschüsse	G. Troiano
Politische Orthographie	E. Most
"Die öffentliche Sache"	P. Brass
Apologie der Kapitulanten	O. E. Lühr

Price 2/-, 40 cents

---

## TO OUR READERS

Contemporary Issues is not conducted as a profit-making concern but is supported solely by sales and the voluntary contributions of friends. We appeal to our readers to assist us by subscribing to our magazine either directly to us or through their respective book-shops and by submitting donations in the form of money, articles, reports, etc.







# CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

---

Vol. 5

JUNE-JULY, 1954

NUMBER 18

---

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Case of Puerto Rico ... ..	66
Year One of the Eisenhower Crusade, by Robert Keller ... ..	86
Vignettes of American Liberty	
(II) The Right to Work, by Martin Norris ... ..	113
Berlin, 17th June . . . , by F. Lohenbill ... ..	115
The Peace Campaign, by R. N. Petrov ... ..	125
The Society for Social Responsibility in Science Growing—not Dying	
(I) Rejoinder to P.M. by Victor Paschkis, Vice-President of The S.S.R.S. ... ..	129
(II) Reply by P.M. ... ..	131
Material and Documents	
America on the Road of Hitler and Stalin ... ..	136
Correspondence ... ..	140

---

Please note our new address in South Africa:

I Florence Maisonettes,  
94 Yeo Street,  
Yeoville, Johannesburg.

*also*

P.O. Box 13, Johannesburg

Subscription rates are 8s. (\$1.60) for four issues.

Published by Contemporary Press, 26 Heber Road, London, N.W.2  
and 545 Fifth Avenue, New York City, 17, N.Y., as a quarterly.

## THE CASE OF PUERTO RICO: A PRESS SYMPOSIUM UNDER THE ASPECTS OF FEAR, HYSTERIA, POLITICAL OPPRESSION AND TERROR IN MODERN SOCIETY

NO. 17 of *Contemporary Issues*, containing the statement on Pedro Albizu-Campos and Puerto Rican affairs, was hardly printed when the American radio and press resounded with the alarming news that four members of Pedro Albizu-Campos' Nationalist Party had demonstrated for their cause by shooting from the gallery of the American Congress and wounding five representatives. If it must be said at the outset and made very clear that acts of terrorism are to be rejected unconditionally and are in themselves by no means suited to advance a political goal — the event is too indicative of the social and political conditions in modern society to be buried under expressions of sorrow and condemnation. To prevent the repetition of desperate acts like the one we have witnessed now (which was preceded in 1950 by the equally desperate attempt of Puerto Rican Nationalists to kill President Truman) it is necessary to uncover and to destroy the root of the evil. It has often been said and explained that besides other social diseases terrorism too springs from the very foundations of our economico-political system which afflicts everybody up to the point of outspoken madness. One has only to open a newspaper to perceive that innumerable reports dealing with acts of burglary, gangsterism, illegal business, sexual crimes, murder and suicide, down to the slaughtering of whole families by a son, a father or a mother who receive the impulse for their deeds "by an inner voice", flow from the same source as race hatred, lynch-justice, political machinations and the institutionalized persecution and obsession of the McCarthy brand. The feeling that "something is basically wrong" is general and finds manifold expression. The *New York Times*, for example, commented 2nd March on the shooting in Congress:

"In short, we live in a period of high *nervous tension*, an *explosive era* in which the *sparks are continually flying and now and then causing such a tragic flare-up as we saw yesterday*. We have to consider a deed of that sort as an aberration." (Author's italics.)

On the same day, Dr. Frank Kingdon speaks in the *New York Post* about "our current turn to violence". He opines:

"We have given way to fear. Men who will stop at nothing to serve their own lust for power have scared us. We hate them for doing it, and we hate ourselves for letting them do it to us. In our panic, we inflate them into something bigger than they are, and turn to mere denunciation energies which are capable of outwitting and defeating them.

"I do not underestimate the danger of the overweening politician distorting our institutions to his own ends. I am as dedicated to defeating his hateful purposes as his most hysterical denouncer. I am only pointing out that he has won his first victory over us when he makes us fight on his terms. He presents a threat which I would be the last to underestimate, but we are going to defeat him and his threat by taking calm, unfrightened thought, and mapping the battle against him intelligently on our own ground.

"... Totalitarianism begins with the individual who says: 'I'm not going to stick my neck out'. If we allow fear to ourselves we are already the allies of a tyranny that may enslave us.

"... It takes a good deal of a man these days to say: 'I am going to say calmly and resolutely what I think'..."

"... Brave men will find each other. They will combine. They will clear the atmosphere of suspicion, restore honest thought to its central place in political discussion, and renew confidence..."

"What we have thus far lost fear has surrendered. What fear has lost courage can restore."

Well stated — nothing can be more important than to say calmly and resolutely what one thinks (also about the *New York Post*) and to restore honest thoughts in political discussions. Meanwhile Henry Beckett writes the same day in the same *New York Post* that the wife of Dr. Irving Peress, "controversial former Army dentist", tried to read a statement in a meeting of the Parent-Teacher Assn.:

"*I think a terrible, frightening thing is happening to our country, she read. 'McCarthyism is riding high'...*"

"She was interrupted by Dr. Morris Jacobs, past commander of the Elmhurst-Jackson Heights branch of the American Legion and past commander of the Jewish War Veterans for the same area. [Disorder ensued and the meeting broke up.]..."

"Had Mrs. Peress been permitted to finish reading, her friends and foes would have heard these sentences:

"*Some of my neighbors who for seven years have befriended me, played with my children, praised my activities in behalf of our school, have become victims of the hysteria whipped up by McCarthy nationally and the Queens papers locally.*"

"*There are those, possibly in this room, who ring my phone at all hours of day and night and then are afraid to identify themselves. Daily my husband and I receive anonymous letters which are intended to strike fear into our hearts.*"

"*They are all violently anti-Semitic.*"

The same day, the Peress case is reviewed by Walter Millis in the *New York Herald Tribune*. Peress had been drafted into the army on the basis of the "doctors' draft" which authorizes the draft of medical and dental specialists above the otherwise maximum age of twenty-five. The real story, however, begins with Dr. Stanley Orloff, "a senior psychiatrist of the New York Department of Mental Hygiene":

"Dr. Orloff had been offered a commission in the Air Force Reserve; but he had simply refused to make any answer at all to the loyalty questionnaire that went with it. He did not get the commission, and shortly afterward found himself in the Army as a private under the 'doctors' draft'. He applied, under the announced policy, for a commission commensurate with his professional standing; and the forms duly arrived, including the 'security' form.

"This form includes a large number of questions about membership in the Communist party or in 'front' organizations, or about attendance at meetings or social contacts and so on; but at the end it explicitly points out that the subject may claim 'Federal privilege' under the Fifth Amendment as to some or all of the questions. Dr. Orloff claimed the blanket privilege; and was denied his commission. Instead, he was shipped as an enlisted man to Fort Lawton, Wash., for transfer to Korea. Then he went to court."

Walter Millis believes that it "would take a Lewis Carrol to deal properly with what followed", for the Army needed the psychiatric skills of Dr. Orloff and with the interference of a Supreme Court order it had, in defence of its own refusal on "security" grounds, to grant Orloff the commission, "to argue that in employing him on such officer's work it did so only under 'limitations', one of them forbidding his use of drugs and sedatives in order to prevent him from eliciting security information from patients!"

"With this incredible[!] proviso on the work of a psychiatrist, one surely passes from Alice-in-Wonderland into plain Bedlam. The Circuit Court finally held (in March, 1952) that the Army did not have to commission Orloff, but that it could retain him only if it employed him in medical work. The case went on to the Supreme court. And at just about this time, in October, 1952, Dr. Irving Peress, a dentist, was called under the draft. In accordance with routine policy, he was tendered a captain's commission; he got the questionnaire along with it; he, like Dr. Orloff, took the blanket privilege which it offered. But he got the commission.

"Why, he himself does not know. Since Dr. Orloff, there had been numerous [!] other cases of the kind. Some were commissioned; some were, and are, serving as enlisted men. . . .

"At any rate, Captain Peress pursued his highly non-sensitive [!] duties as a dental surgeon. Meanwhile a new administration came in pledged to get the Communists out of government; the Supreme Court upheld the Orloff decision, but with a blistering minority castigation of the Army's conduct; and the draft act was amended (in June, 1953) to provide specifically that medical draftees 'shall' be appointed to grades commensurate with their experience. Under this provision, Captain Peress was tendered . . . promotion to major. This was routine and did not involve a questionnaire.

"Meanwhile, the Army had, however, looked again into the Peress case. He had been given another security questionnaire, before the promotion routine, and had again used the 'privilege'. By this time, the 'heat' of the Eisenhower security campaign, as enthusiastically applied by the McCarthyites, was on. With the amendment to the act, the Army couldn't demote Peress; it couldn't simply fire him as a Fifth Amendment pleader (without also discharging numerous others now serving as privates); it certainly could not court-martial him, since there were no charges; so it decided to declare him 'surplus' and let him out under the honorable discharge procedure normal in such cases.

"It was at this point that Senator McCarthy waded in with both arms swinging, to seize upon the case as a means of 'getting' the Army with the charge of pro-Communist 'stupidity or treason' in its top echelons. It seems to me that the Army had a very good case with which to expose just the kind of hysteria, fantasy and utter folly to which McCarthyism has reduced us. But Secretary Stevens was himself so much a victim of the McCarthy terror [!] that instead he wrote his original letter admitting 'defects' in the procedure and promising 'investigation'. If he had asked, instead, what there was to investigate, other than the acts of Congress and the excesses of its committees, which created the whole imbroglio, subsequent events might have taken a different, and far more constructive, course."

Now, the same day and the following day all newspapers reveal voluntarily or involuntarily to what extent the McCarthy-terrorism alone has affected thousands of people in, so to speak, no time. Since comments and information are more precise on 3rd March, it may for 2nd March only be noted that the Americans for Democratic Action demanded President Eisenhower dismiss Civil Service Commission Chairman Young for perpetrating "a political hoax" with his claims of government security firings. They characterized the firings in a statement issued by James Doyle by saying that Young "failed to produce proof of a single Communist having been 'fired'. Instead, he produced a vague category of suspected subversives and then admitted that he had no evidence that their separation had anything to do with subversion". 3rd March, W. H. Lawrence writes in the *New York Times*:

"Three hundred eighty-three persons were included . . . in a broadly defined 'subversive' category among 2,427 security risk separations from Government employment during the final seven [!] months of 1953.

"Philip Young, chairman of the Civil Service Commission, explained to a Senate committee, however, that he could not say any [!] or all of the 383 were either Communists or subversives. . . .

"His breakdown of 'security risk' separations, authorized by President Eisen-

hower, did not satisfy protesting Democrats. They contended the truth still was being withheld on the actual number of disloyal persons weeded out of Government.

"The breakdown did not support the claims of Republican leaders, such as Senator Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin, either. They have contended that more than 90 per cent of those removed from Government under the security program were either subversives or sexual perverts. . . .

"The Democrats wanted to know why none of the persons listed in the 'subversive' category had been indicted or prosecuted, at least for perjury, if they had falsified their Governmental employment forms denying membership in proscribed groups. Mr. Young did not agree that prosecutions should necessarily be based on the type [!] of information available to the Government.

"Senator Pastore was alternately amused and angry at Mr. Young's unwillingness to answer questions directly.

"At one point, Mr. Pastore said the 'matter would not be so amusing if it wasn't so confusing'. Later, he charged a 'deliberate effort' by the Administration to keep the facts about the security risks from reaching the public.

"Senator John Sherman Cooper, Kentucky Republican, protested he could not agree with Senator Pastore's charge.

"It's a fact', Senator Pastore responded. 'They are giving the impression all these people are disloyal. They keep beating the bush and we are not getting the facts'."

'The *New York Post*, under the heading "Bad Day for Hoaxers", writes triumphantly in an Editorial:

"At last the hoax is exploded.

"For several months the country was told that one of the great triumphs of the new Administration was the elimination of '2,200 security risks'. High Administration officials proclaimed that the vast majority of this group had been ousted because of subversion; Joe McCarthy, it need hardly be added, echoed and elaborated the point. All this was supposed to prove that Dwight D. Eisenhower had inherited from Harry Truman a régime riddled with traitors.

"Now, a little shamefaced, Civil Service Commission Chairman Philip Young admits that, of the 2,200, exactly 383 were separated because of charges of 'a subversive nature' — and he is unable to say that there was a single case in which the charges were proved. All he can say is that somebody had said something derogatory about the 383, and off went their heads.

"What will the hoaxers produce next?"

This is the tenor of the day, and even that fine paper called *New York Journal-American* cannot avoid noting:

"Young said that although 383 of the security cases were in the 'subversive' column of his list, it 'does not mean they are Communists or subversives', but only that in their files 'there was information of a subversive nature'."

One may, after all this, imagine how many people in a free democratic country are, with their families, affected by procedures against which there is no defence. But it happens every day that the American press sheds crocodile tears about suppression and terror in the Russian Empire and in the colonies from Indo-China to South America. Just that ardent defender and praiser of McCarthy the "Nationalist" (Mr. Sokolsky is responsible for this, in respect to other countries, highly denounced designation; see his article of 8th March), the *New York Journal-American*, printed in bold letters the following article by William P. Flythe:

#### *Reds 'Transfer' Thousands to Doom*

"Washington, March 8. — A new Russian purge to-day is sending thousands of Russians into oblivion under the guise of 'transferred to other duties'.

"State Department intelligence officials said that the Communists have modified the system of liquidation to the extent of writing the brief notation behind the name of a person instead of completely destroying the record.

"Reports show that at least 3,000 Reds in the province of Georgia who owed their position to Lavrentia Beria, executed head of the dread secret police, had been given transfers.

"These are relatively minor officials and are exclusive of Red leaders liquidated since Beria met his fate last year.

"The purge has been extended into Armenia and Azerbaijan on a large scale. Other provinces have been affected but reports reaching the U.S. are scanty.

"Friends and relatives of the hapless persons transferred have discovered that the disappearance was just as complete as in the former days.

"The 'transferred to other duties' is accepted as meaning to the prison camps or a firing squad.

"The formality is brief. [!] An armed guard appears at the home or place of work and the victim is marched off after a squad leader has made the 'transfer' notation by the name.

"He is given no opportunity to pack for a journey or even to say good-bye.

"In the agricultural areas the Red guards sometimes say that the 'transfer' is being made because of some crop failure but the results have been the same.

"There is no instance in which anyone 'transferred' has been heard from again."

Gruesome and revolting as this report is — it is not so far from homeland; and if the *formality* in Russia is "brief" it is by no means long in the United States. For what shall one say of the following statement by W. H. Lawrence in his *New York Times* article of 3rd March:

"He [Young] did not know how many had been dismissed, how many had resigned, or how many had received written notes [!] that such 'subversive' allegations were on file against them.

"Democratic Senators said that at future hearings they would ask Mr. Young if there had been any [!] investigation or considered evaluation whether the allegations of 'subversive' associations in the files of the 383 persons were true or false. . . .

"Numbers and categories aside, it has been brought out that so-called loyalty files on Federal employees contain all manner of hearsay [!] evidence, grudge [!] letters and other uncorroborated [!] material as well as sworn testimony. These 'files' are classified 'secret' [!], however, and may not be produced except by Presidential order."

The destruction of democracy is always characterized by persecution of political beliefs, by concentration camps (already installed in the U.S. to receive future victims), labor camps (suggested on 1st March by Senators McCarthy and Everett M. Dirksen especially as "disagreeable" labor camps for armed services personnel who were Communists or who invoked the Fifth Amendment when asked about Communist associations), secrecy in general, secret denunciation in particular and so on until the foundations of democracy are eaten away and fascism appears. Let it be repeated, therefore, that terrorism of all shades flows from, and is created by, our present economic system and manifests itself all over the world from Kenya (where the so-called Mau Mau "terrorism" is simply the enforced self-defence of people threatened with destruction) to China and way back to the United States. It is on this general background of hysteria, insecurity and nervous tension (also in the colonial world) that we must investigate and evaluate the desperate act of the four Puerto Ricans in the American Congress. Concerning the main figure of the shooting quartet, Mrs. Lolita Lebron, the *New York Times* of 2nd March (writer is Clayton Knowles) reports:

"At police headquarters Mrs. Lebron said none of the four had intended to kill anyone.

"She said the shooting date had been picked to coincide with the opening of the Inter-American Conference at Caracas. . . .

"A note found in her purse by the police read:

"Before God and the world my blood claims for the independence of Puerto Rico. My life I give for the freedom of my country. This is a cry for victory in

our struggle for independence. Which more than a half century has tried to conquer that land that belongs to Puerto Rico.

"I state that the United States of America are betraying the sacred principles of mankind in their continuous subjugation of my country, violating their rights to be a free nation and a free people in their barbarous torture of our apostle of independence, Don Pedro Albizu Campos."

"Across the back of the note was scrawled: 'I take responsible for all.'"

Whatever one may think of this — it is clear that such tragic tones have as little to do with a blue sky as the shooting of the Nazi Ambassador Herr von Rath by the young Greenspan, as the Boston Tea-Party, the American Revolution or the attempt of the German Generals on Hitler's life; acts of violence besides which were differently judged in different quarters. In any case, the *New York Herald Tribune* gives on 2nd March additional information about Mrs. Lebron's personal attitude:

"Did you shoot to kill or wound?" newsmen asked.

"Not to kill," she said. The shooting, she added, 'was my idea. It was the idea of four of us. I feel I did something for my country' . . .

"Asked why the group picked the House of Representatives and not the Senate, she replied:

"We chose the House because it is very important and because there are represented the lawmakers of the United States which has dominated our country for half a century' . . .

"She was asked if another attempt might be made such as this one and she said yes. 'As long as Puerto Rico is not free you can have for granted that things that are disgusting are going to happen. Maybe it takes fifty years to happen, maybe not, but anything might happen.'

"She said the United States can send Puerto Ricans to war but the Puerto Ricans do not have full representation. She said the legislature of Puerto Rico is composed of men pledged to the United States and not to bring freedom to Puerto Rico, and until that can be changed conditions in Puerto Rico won't improve.

"When someone asked her why different people weren't elected in free elections to the Puerto Rico legislature she said that is impossible. She said the United States imposed itself on Puerto Rico and what was imposed was not the will of the Puerto Rican people. . . .

"A reporter asked again if she wasn't sorry for what happened this afternoon and wasn't sorry for her part in it. She said no country has been free unless people die for it and she had no regret.

"Mrs. Lebron suddenly said that the members of the party of liberation in Puerto Rico believe that Albizu was bombarded by an atomic device while he was held in jail and that they have been trying to get atomic scientists to investigate.

"Mrs. Lebron said that in Puerto Rico are 'many women in prison and many political prisoners'. She said she wanted to bring their plight to the world's attention.

"Asked if her religion, Roman Catholic, didn't forbid such violent act, she sharply told reporters that religion had nothing to do with the fight for freedom. 'When you liberate your people they fight and die that religion had nothing to do for your country'. She insisted with it."

March 2nd, the *New York World-Telegram* publishes an interview with a member of the Puerto Rican Nationalist party (John Carcel) conducted by Bernard Nossiter. Mr. Carcel

"insisted yesterday's plot was not organized by his party as a party, but solely by the individuals involved.

" . . . he said he knew the ringleader, Lolita Lebron . . . but added:

"I did not know she was going to do this. Neither did anyone else in the party, except those who went to Washington with her. And neither did we learn of the attempt to kill President Truman until after it happened'.

"He said the party motto of 'Sacrifice and Valor' is the key 'to an understanding of what we do'.



"We do not draw our members from any one strata of society", he explained. "Unlike other ideologies, we see society divided between the spiritual group and the stomach group. We are the spiritual group, the true patriots".

"Mr. Carcel emphasized that the party was not organized into a series of cells like the Communist party. Instead, he said the members made individual decisions on how 'best to further Puerto Rican independence'.

"Our hope is that the United States will voluntarily give up Puerto Rico", the printer [Carcel] continued. "The Nationalists believe Puerto Rico was better off under Spanish rule. Before the United States took over in 1898, we had our own currency and carried on our own foreign affairs".

"Nationalists do not even participate in Puerto Rican elections, Mr. Carcel said, 'because this would imply tacit acceptance of United States rule'.

"On Puerto Rico itself, there are about three or four thousand active Nationalists. They are followers of Pedro Albizu Campos, a Harvard graduate and World War I veteran. His revolutionary impulse is said to have originated in the discrimination he suffered for his dark skin at school and in the Army."

Before turning to Albizu Campos himself, it is important to present what the attitude of the other opposition party of the island, namely the "sizeable" Independence party, is. On 12th December, 1953, Sydney Gruson wrote in the *New York Times*:

"A great debate is under way in Puerto Rico on the question of the island's relationship with the United States. It will probably result in a formal request to Washington for more autonomy for the island government.

"The debate was touched off by President Eisenhower's offer to support complete independence or more self-rule if the Puerto Rican Legislature asked for it. . . .

"The President's offer would seem to have forced the hand of Gov. Louis Muñoz Marin, the architect of the island's present status as a commonwealth associated with the United States. His main opposition, the Independence party, has seized on the offer as a political weapon. It is a powerful one so long as some aspects of the present relationship that trouble practically all [!] Puerto Ricans remain unchanged.

"The Independence party can point to loopholes in the argument that commonwealth status gave the island legislative autonomy in local [!] affairs. So long as this is so even the Puerto Ricans most eager for the closest association with the United States will have an uneasy feeling that there is too much truth in the opposition's charge that the 'old colonial relationship still exists without a fundamental [!] change'.

"There is no likelihood of the Legislature's asking for complete independence. When the Legislature reconvenes in January to consider the President's offer, the opposition will probably ask that a referendum be held, but it is unlikely too. Governor Muñoz Marin believes that the island's present status was overwhelmingly approved by the 1952 election results and various votes while the status was being changed in 1951.

"The Legislature is dominated by the Popular party, which the Governor founded and of which he is undisputed leader.

"The crux of the opposition's case is that the island has no legislative autonomy, and it seems inevitable that Governor Muñoz Marin must pick up the President's offer to support more autonomy if the sting is to be drawn from the opposition's charges.

"The fact that Puerto Ricans are drafted, for example, has enabled the opposition to coin a potent propaganda phrase: 'They say no taxation without representation. We pay no taxes in money but taxation in blood'.

"All Federal laws except those dealing with revenue matters have effect in Puerto Rico, although the island has no representation in Congress. Not only the draft but laws dealing with labor relations, bankruptcy proceedings and rent control must be accepted by Puerto Rico, although the people here feel that their own Legislature is better fitted to draft laws for local conditions.

"Many Puerto Ricans believe that the Legislature here should have the right to review all laws passed by Congress on the question of applicability to the

island. They would give Puerto Rico the right of veto over legislation found unsuitable.

Furthermore, they believe that decisions of the Puerto Rico Supreme Court should be appealed directly to the United States Supreme Court, not via the Federal District Court in Boston as at present. They believe also that Puerto Rico should have the right to negotiate local trade treaties and the right to accept immigrants useful to the island's economy though they might not be able to enter the United States.

"United States interests, it is realized here, must be protected in matters such as trade and immigration. But Puerto Ricans who want these changes think this protection could be worked out easily. . . .

"The Governor said defense matters might be arranged in a 'more democratic manner', a reference to the fact that Puerto Ricans are drafted although they have no Congressional representation. . . .

"The record shows that the great majority of Puerto Ricans backs the Governor's view. [For the majority question and other matters, see the "Excerpts" following this presentation.] Dr. Gilberto Concepcion de Gracia, president of the Independence party, contends that the Popular party got its votes approving commonwealth status by turning the entire island government into a party instrument and by becoming the 'most corrupt machine we have ever known'.

"Few Puerto Ricans support this assessment of the Popular party."

There are, on the contrary, many indications that the "assessment" is quite popular. Sydney Gruson himself remarks before: "But it is significant that the Independence party won 20 per cent of the 1952 vote". The Independence party has, in contrast to the Governor who "changed his mind" on the question of independence, a consistent standpoint on the whole matter. On 29th November, 1953, the *New York Times* reported: "The Independence party, which demands complete freedom from the United States, took an opposite view [to that of the Governor]. Vicente Geigel Polanco, its legal adviser, said General Eisenhower's message was a simple admission of the fact that the Independence party had been right in charging that Puerto Rico's present status was 'just a colonial farce'." The *New York Journal-American* of 2nd March states: "The Independence faction's resolution lay the blame for the incident [the shooting in Congress] on the 'present colonial system' in Puerto Rico. It was not voted on by the lawmakers". And in the *New York Times* of 7th March, Peter Kihss again points out: "The opposing side endorse differing political ends but acknowledge a common economic enemy — Puerto Rico's widespread hunger . . . Senator Gilberto Concepcion de Gracia . . . calls the situation 'colonialism'."

It goes without saying that the press behaved very badly, beating the drum of the "Red" hunters, displaying hysteria and far from going to the heart of the matter. The *N.Y. Journal-American* blatantly misquoted Lolita Lebrón's employer as saying that the F.B.I. had her under surveillance as "a suspected Communist". On the basis of this misquotation it carried the screaming front-page headline: "F.B.I. Was On Trail Of Assassin As Red". Although another New York newspaper reported that the employer denied ever having made this statement, the *Journal-American* repeated the "suspicion" of Communist affiliation the next day, again citing the employer as its authority. Some of the language used by this paper against the Puerto Rican nationalists seems to have been borrowed straight from the vocabulary of Vishinsky in the days when he handled the Moscow Trials. Page 8 of the 2nd March edition carried the bold headline: "Mad-Dog Terrorist Group Has 500 Members", and Paul R. Leach of the

*Journal-American* staff asserted, contrary to the simple truth, that Pedro Albizu Campos "is now reported to be in a mental institution". Mis-statements of that sort under the label "it is reported" nearly typify the journalistic level to which the press descended. Even the self-styled "respectable" press failed to emerge with honor. The lovely and always "liberal" *New York Post*, which printed fine stuff like the article by Dr. Frank Kingdon, is no exception. After printing and then clarifying the false imputation of a criminal record to Lolita Lebron in one issue, it brazenly repeated parts of this "record" in a sob-sister article on Mrs. Lebron in a later issue. The *New York Times* quoted a few perfunctory words from a statement by Julio Pinto Gandia, a representative of the Nationalist party in the United States, and then exhibited a remarkable haste to delve into a lengthy quotation from a pro-Government Puerto Rican. And since the Inter-American Conference was meeting and the conflict of the United States with Guatemala was pending, the *New York World-Telegram* of 2nd March featured the little item:

"Guatemala's President Arbenz Guzman told his Congress to-day that business interests 'dominant in the U.S. are bent on intervening in Guatemalan internal affairs on the pretext of curbing communism'."

This item was promptly followed on page 8 by the utterance of a spokesman for the Department of Interior, which has charge of Puerto Rico:

"We know definitely [!] that there is a link between Communists in Puerto Rico and Guatemala and that there is a plan to terrorize the Capital. We may expect more of this.

"This plot [the shooting in Congress] was undoubtedly [!] directed by Reds in Guatemala."

Nobody stops to reflect that the unceasing evocation of the "Communist" danger is strongly reminiscent of Hitler's tactics of using this device for quite different ends and that it is a self-defeating device, especially in a great and strong and beneficial democracy such as the generally benevolent United States. Chance has it that Guillermo Toriello, Guatemalan Foreign Minister, made a speech at the Inter-American Conference (5th March). According to the *New York Times* of 6th March, he said:

"Firmly, as in the past, the Guatemalan delegation will categorically oppose any resolution or declaration that under the pretext of communism, violates the fundamental principles of democracy, postulates the violation of the rights of man, or injures the principle of non-intervention, or that leads to the tendency to convert Pan-Americanism into an instrument to hold the peoples of Latin America in semi-colonial conditions in the benefit of the powerful interests of foreign monopolies.

"We also oppose emphatically the internationalization of McCarthyism, of book-burning and the imposition of stereotyped thought.

"And we denounce, to this conference and to the conscience of America, the political aggression and the threats of economic aggression and of intervention of which the Republic of Guatemala is victim."

Far more interesting than Toriello's hour-long speech is the comment which Sydney Gruson gives on its effect:

"The delegates were extremely attentive to the Guatemalan spokesman. There were no interruptions for applause, but when he finished he received the warmest ovation yet accorded any [!] speaker at the conference. The applause at the end lasted a minute, almost twice as long as that given Mr. Dulles yesterday, when the Secretary warned that international communism should be treated as a danger to hemisphere peace. . . .

"He expressed hope for the hemisphere's 'final liberation from the United States', carefully reminding his listeners of some ancient aspects of United States policy that pain virtually all [!] Latins. He spoke of the days when the

United States Marines landed in Latin America, of profits taken abroad by the United Fruit company and others and the present worries over falling prices for Latin-American raw materials.

"Democracy has lost ground in many parts of Latin America in recent years, he declared, and in its place neo-Fascism has arisen. He charged that totalitarians were gathering under the 'negative flag' of anti-communism with only one purpose in mind — to oppose the people's progress.

"Pan-Americanism has no meaning unless it tackles the hemisphere's 'real' problems, Señor Toriello emphasized. He described these problems as underdeveloped areas and the misery, poverty and social backwardness of the peoples living in them."

Indeed, the "Red"-hunting is self-defeating — nobody tries to explain why Mr. Toriello's speech earned such a warm reception if he did not hit the mark. Is there any serious explanation why there is "widespread hunger" in Puerto Rico while it is a "Commonwealth" with tremendous surpluses of stock with which it does not know what to do? Is there, further, any decent explanation why it was necessary to re-arrest Pedro Albizu-Campos, to arrest 46 (or more) other Puerto Rican nationalists and Communists, followed by, what is called by Lumbard, "the largest peacetime roundup of Federal witnesses in connection with a single conspiracy" in New York and Chicago, while the only thing lacking in the whole affair is the "conspiracy" on the part of the Puerto Rican nationalists? The press behaves badly in all these cases and gives the Puerto Rican nationalists not even a fair hearing. A press-release by the committee of *Americans for Puerto Rico's Independence* (3rd March, printed in the annex to this symposium) was issued for nothing, and the only paper which, to any extent worth mentioning, gave Pedro Albizu Campos the floor was the *New York World-Telegram* of 2nd March. This paper, regardless of what it otherwise is, printed at least excerpts from an article by Campos which appeared in the January-February issue of the Spanish language newspaper *Puerto Rico en Marcha*. These excerpts read:

"The United States is the only power which imposes compulsory selective service in her colonies, taking the youth of the little countries that belong to the U.S. and using them to kill citizens of other nations that have never offended Puerto Rico, making them die on battlefields like those of Korea, in order to serve the interests of imperialism, all the while claiming that the U.S. is serving the cause of Korean independence and the cause of democracy throughout the world.

"Meanwhile, Puerto Rico keeps on being a mere public domain of the U.S. because they figure that with this designation Puerto Rico is under the power of the House of Representatives, which has jurisdiction over it.

#### "National Forest"

"The pretence of the U.S. is that Puerto Rico is nothing more than a national forest, from Fajardo to Las Marias. By the laws of the U.S. Puerto Rico is designated a 'forest zone', and private property is very limited.

"Without consulting the elected governor of the local legislature, the national monuments of Puerto Rico, such as San Cristobal, San Jeronimo, El Morro, and others, have been declared national monuments of the United States.

#### "Warlike Uses"

"The government of the United States has expropriated large areas of land for warlike uses, including nearly the whole island of Vieques, converting Puerto Rico into an atomic base, and making experiments with atomic weapons, especially against the Nationalist prisoners that are in jail in Puerto Rico since the October, 1950, revolution.

"[The United States has a guided-missiles installation in Puerto Rico but no atomic projects are known. — Ed. (of the *World Telegram*).]

"These attacks continue, and against the president of the Nationalist party at his base, in the hope of converting the base into a fiery furnace at the mercy of the armed forces of the United States.

*"Repeated Attacks"*

"Talking now in the first person, because of the responsibility that we have for our country and the civilized world, we declare that President Eisenhower of the United States is responsible for the repeated attacks against the Nationalist prisoners and against my own life in my very home, because by the law of the Congress . . . the armed forces . . . cannot use atomic weapons . . . without an express order from the supreme commander.

"This serious charge is now before the United Nations and will be aired at the first opportunity.

"Eisenhower is letting himself open to a serious blow against his personal prestige by maintaining this irresponsible attitude toward the Puerto Rican nation.

*"An Empty Gesture"*

"The action of presenting himself before the United Nations as a spokesman for Puerto Rican independence is an empty gesture, because he has well said that he can do nothing without a Congressional law.

"A humiliation is that the United States is going to withdraw her armed forces from Puerto Rico and terminate her military aid to our land.

"Recently we have seen the governor of Puerto Rico, Mr. Muñoz Marin, serving as the escort of the wife of the president of Panama, Remon. And an immigration inspector of the United States grabbed her by the shoulders in the presence of the governor to examine her documents. The protest of Muñoz Marin was of no avail, naturally, because the entry and exit to Puerto Rico is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, not only as far as merchandise is concerned but also as far as people are concerned."

There remain a few words to say about the fantastic charge of Campos being subjected to atomic radiation or the like. The charge is a pet among Puerto Rican Nationalists, but all information gathered by us so far indicates first that Campos went to prison as a healthy man and was released from prison as a sick one. Secondly, he suffers from skin-deformations or spots looking like burns, the origin of which has not been cleared up. Campos himself appears extremely distrustful of most persons and has refused to be examined in a hospital. Most of the propaganda of the Nationalists centers around their venerated leader and it seems imperative that a completely neutral medical expert or radiologist be sent to Puerto Rico for a thoroughgoing examination of Campos' state of health. There seems, at this moment, little doubt that Campos is not mentally disturbed, but that he has greatly suffered and is obsessed by the idea of being subjected to atomic radiation. If this matter is settled, the members of his party most worried about the fate of their leader (now 62 years old) will turn their energy from propaganda conducted around the sufferings of Campos to political propaganda enlightening the people of Puerto Rico and the world on the case of Puerto Rico until a majority decides for a democratic change. If the United States, for its part, wants to extinguish the fire from which the smoke emerges, then it should not be difficult for a great and mighty democracy to "voluntarily give up Puerto Rico", a small island, the people of which want to live in friendship and peace with it and the world. As for the shooting demonstrators in Congress who do not appear as cowards: It is high time that American democracy introduces in its code of law a distinction even known and respected in Tsarist Russia and Germany under Wilhelm II — the distinction between, and the corresponding judgement of, political and criminal offences.

## APPENDICES

## I. EXCERPTS FROM "PUERTO RICO, Caribbean Crossroads".

by Lewis C. Richardson

Not only was Puerto Rico settled by Europeans earlier than any other area now under United States sovereignty, but it is also the place where that sovereignty received its first international recognition. At the height of the Revolutionary War, the American ships *Endawock* and *Henry*, sorely pressed by their British pursuer, the *Glasgow*, took refuge in the harbor of Mayagüez. The British Captain demanded that the local authorities turn over the Yankee ships and crews to him. The citizens of Mayagüez, however, took matters into their own hands by putting the crews into hiding. And, after due deliberation, the local authorities replied in the most courteous terms, of course, that they were bound to respect the sovereignty of a friendly nation. When the determined Britishers were making ready to seize their prizes, the good people of Mayagüez thoughtfully hoisted the Royal Spanish flag over the *Endawock* and the *Henry*. The Captain of the *Glasgow*, to avoid an international incident, made off to sea, cursing Puerto Rican punctiliousness and hospitality. An appeal to the Spanish Governor-General brought an equally courteous and punctilious decision upholding the stand taken by the people and authorities of Mayagüez.

Most of the some 30,000 Taino aborigines were killed off during the early days of the colony by Carib raiders, the Spanish, epidemics, and hurricanes, and their place as laborers was taken by Negro slaves. . . . Slavery, however, attained no small economic importance in the plantation system that gradually arose to replace the frustrated hopes of great mineral wealth.

Puerto Rico, therefore, is proud that the year after the close of the American Civil War, a Puerto Rican journalist and his American wife founded the Spanish Abolition Society in Madrid; that Puerto Rico consistently demanded Negro emancipation; that it finally persuaded the Spanish Republic of 1873 to liberate all the slaves on the island; and that, from that day till this, the so-called "racial problem" has been less acute in Puerto Rico than in most other countries.

**We Are a Colony**

Despite the numerous smaller tributaries that have swelled the stream of our national life, we are still predominantly Spanish in blood, traditions, and manner of living. Spanish is also the language of our homes, our churches, and our Legislature, though we value English as a second language and teach it in all our schools. Since 1898, when the United States took over our island, we have come into close contact with American ways of life. In them we have seen much to admire, much that we have



been able to adapt to our own needs and assimilate into our own culture. For all this we are grateful. What, as a self-respecting people, we have always resented, is any attempt to *impose* customs and norms upon us, any suggestion that we should slavishly copy rather than wisely choose and truly assimilate.

Politically we still belong to the United States, and some of us would like to continue to do so — as the forty-ninth State of the Union. Others of us would be satisfied with nothing short of complete independence. All of us, however, are agreed that our present colonial status is morally degrading, economically untenable, and politically in direct contradiction to the great spirit of American democracy that we so sincerely admire. And all of our political parties heartily applauded President Truman's recent message to Congress urging that Puerto Rico be allowed to decide, by means of a plebiscite, its future as a nation.\*

Since all our leaders, and the masses of people behind them, anathematize the colonial system under which we live, it may be well to explain in passing, what we mean by that term. It is true that official utterances have attempted to avoid the word *colony* in referring to Puerto Rico, and that some of the euphemisms employed in its place have been, to say the least, amusing. The classical example of this beating about the bush is the famous Supreme Court decision which defines Puerto Rico as "belonging to, but not forming part of the United States of America". We, however, insist that we are a colony and that we don't like it. And here are a few of the things that we mean when we make these assertions.

First of all, under the colonial status we have recently been receiving considerable sums of Federal moneys. Although Puerto Rico must be mentioned by name in order to benefit from any appropriations bill that covers the forty-eight states, we have lately been treated generously in this respect. This generosity is a paternalistic one, however: Congress, like the Lord, can give and it can take away without our having anything to say about the matter. Furthermore, Federal grants are, of course, made for specific purposes; and these purposes often turn out to be palliatives rather than correctives in an unstable economic structure such as ours.

Colonialism also means to us that, although we are American citizens, we have no participation in the national government so long as we continue to live in Puerto Rico. Our only approach to representation comes through our Resident Commissioner, who has a voice in the lower house of Congress but no vote.

Even the Constitution of the United States does not protect us here on the Island, except as some of its provisions may be included in specially enacted laws. Our own substitute for a constitution is the so-called Organic Act, in the formulation of which we had no part.

\* What lay behind Truman's message is, perhaps, best indicated by an entry in Rexford Guy Tugwell's "journal", dated 23rd August, 1945: "He [Truman] readily grasped the point that a plebiscite held in any other way [Tugwell does not quite tell us what this "way" was] would certainly be rigged in favor of independence because its advocates would surround it with favorable conditions to which the Congress would never agree. He was very clear in being against independence." (Rexford Guy Tugwell, *The Stricken Land*, pg. xix.) Tugwell is a former Governor of Puerto Rico and an apologist for the Roosevelt and Truman Administrations' rule over the island. — Editors, *Contemporary Issues*.



Our colonial Governor is appointed by the President, with the consent of the United States Senate; and this Governor has the power of veto over the Puerto Rican Legislature even when the latter has maintained itself within the limits set by the Organic Act. If the Governor's decision is overruled by a two-thirds majority, the veto power is merely transferred to the President, whose decision is final.

The Auditor of Puerto Rico, the Attorney General, the members of the Supreme Court, the Federal Judge, and the Commissioner of Education are likewise presidential appointees. The making of our laws, their interpretation, and their administration are therefore strictly under the thumb of a government that we have had no part in electing and which in no way democratically represents us. We cannot even educate our own children as we see fit, for the Commissioner of Education is invested with almost czaristic powers, which permit him to formulate the courses of study, supervise the instruction, and appoint the teachers of the Island in our highly centralized system of education.\*

More subtle, but no less serious, than these overt influences of the colony, are its psychological effects upon us. When an adult is kept attached to his mother's — or, worse yet, his stepmother's — apronstrings, no matter how well-meaning that mother or stepmother may be, the results are likely to be prolonged adolescence, or a spirit of negative rebelliousness, or both. In the case of our country, these concomitants of colonialism have been aggravated by the feeling that we are adrift, that no one knows whither we are bound. The government of the United States has never made any official statement of intentions regarding our final political status, nor have we ever been consulted as to our choice in the matter. The only possible way out of this psychological dead-end lies in the hope that Congress will heed President Truman's message and recognize our right to decide our own future.

Whatever that future may be, it must be carefully planned for. These plans must take into account the manifold problems that confront our country, some of them the direct or indirect results of the colonial system itself.

One of these problems is overpopulation. Puerto Rico is one of the most densely inhabited agricultural regions in the entire world. Smaller than any State of the Union except Rhode Island and Delaware, our land is more thickly settled than any state except industrial Rhode Island, and we have a greater total population than any of twenty-seven out of the forty-eight states.

On top of this, and partly because of it, we have a one-crop economy: in Puerto Rico, sugar is king. This condition is complicated by a considerable amount of absentee ownership. Furthermore, the logical escape into industrialization is made difficult by an almost complete lack of natural resources, and by the long distance from both raw materials and markets. The conse-

\* This no longer is the case. The Governor of Puerto Rico under the Constitution of 1950 is elected by residents of the Island on the basis of universal suffrage; insular authorities, for most part, are locally appointed or elected. But the veto power of the President of the United States still remains, and Federal Courts are under the jurisdiction of Boston and Philadelphia. This reduces virtually all final legislative and judicial decisions in Puerto Rico to a sham. cf. pages 79 to 84 in this issue. — Editors, *Contemporary Issues*.

quent high freight rates are further boosted by the United States Coastwise Shipping Laws. Infant industries that somehow manage to overcome these obstacles and get a start, are often strangled shortly after birth by the process of dumping, against which there is no recourse within the Federal tariff laws.

All these basic problems tie in economically with problems of education, public health, and a hundred more, to form a vicious circle of Gordian knots. The seriousness of the general situation is revealed by the fact that the income of the average person is \$65.00 per year, and that of the average family, \$350.00.

But in spite of the blackness of the picture, we have not cried quits. We believe that we have found the sword to cut the Gordian knots that surround us, and we have already begun hacking them away, fiber by fiber. Our weapon is the concerted, democratic action of a people who are willing to sacrifice their individual, selfish interests to the good of the country as a whole. We shall continue to wield that weapon until every last knot is cut.

(*PUERTO RICO, Caribbean Crossroads*, produced under the sponsorship of the Board of Publications of the University of Puerto Rico, published by the U.S. Camera Publishing Corp., New York, 1947.)

## FREE PUERTO RICO

Julius Eichel, Editor — Committee for the Organization of Americans for Puerto Rico's Independence

No. 1

August 31, 1953

### WILL THE UNITED NATIONS DECIDE THAT PUERTO RICO'S NEW CONSTITUTION — REJECTED AT HOME — PROVIDES SELF GOVERNMENT?

Claiming that Puerto Rico is no longer a non-self-governing territory, the United States Government announced last January 19th that it will submit no more reports on that territory to the United Nations Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories. During the present session of that Committee, our Government hopes to gain international sanction for its contention that the present Federal Relations Act and Constitution of Puerto Rico provide a "full measure of self-government" for that island and her people.

This contention is based upon a series of misrepresentations in respect to (1) what the exact relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico is under the present Federal Relations Act and Constitution; (2) how the present form of government evolved; and (3) what Puerto Rican sentiment is in respect to it. We present herein facts in refutation of this con-

tention in the hope that our compatriots, once they are informed, will insist that our Government base its statements in respect of Puerto Rico, both at home and abroad, upon the true situation, and that they will insist that our Government renounce imperialism and grant genuine freedom to Puerto Rican people.

### **What Self-Government Does Puerto Rico Now Have ?**

Public Law 600 of the 81st United States Congress forms the basis of the present relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States. In passing this law in 1950, Congress acted upon its authority to pass any law it chooses in respect to Puerto Rico — authority which this act neither abolishes nor diminishes. For or against this law no Puerto Rican could vote, since Puerto Ricans have no participation at all in the legislative body that exercises absolute unilateral authority over their country.

All that Public Law 600 did was to repeal 34 of the 58 Articles of the Organic Act, by which Puerto Rican people, if they so chose, might draft a Constitution to take the place of these 34 Articles. About the remaining 24 Articles of the Organic Act the people of Puerto Rico could do nothing. Our Congress determined unilaterally which Articles should be repealed and which should remain in force. Thus Congress, without Puerto Rican participation, fixed the framework within which the present Constitution might be drafted.

Congress repealed no Articles affecting the framework within which the precarious Puerto Rican economy is forced to function. Coast-wise shipping laws, tariff laws and trade agreements, established without Puerto Rican participation, still shut Puerto Rico off from the world market both for buying and for selling. Congress did not risk, either, allowing Puerto Rican participation in military matters affecting the island. Puerto Rican land and men alike remain at the disposal of the United States Armed Forces, without any Puerto Rican having anything to say about it.

All that Congress permitted the new Constitution to deal with, in other words, were trivia having no vital bearing on Puerto Rican life. It could change the number of members in the Puerto Rican legislative assembly, but it could not increase the scope of its authority. It could have moved the seat of local government from San Juan to some other locality, but it was powerless to invest that government with any final authority. It could increase the salaries of the judges of the insular courts, but it could not prevent their interpretations of Puerto Rican law from being overruled in the federal courts of the United States (in which Puerto Ricans have no participation, either direct or delegated). It could dub the insular government with the title "Associated Free State", but it could not remove any aspect of Puerto Rican life from the unilateral control of the United States Government.

Thus Puerto Rico, under the new Constitution, remains under the complete authority of the United States Congress, which may, at will, even abolish the Constitution itself. Thus Puerto Rico continues as before, without any genuine self-government at all.

### **How Did The Constitution Develop ?**

Our Government has told the United Nations that, in the 1948 elections, the Puerto Rican people rejected both independence and statehood, and

elected the Popular Party to office on a platform advocating a Constitution. It has stated that for this reason Congress passed Public Law 600.

Any study of newspaper writeups of the 1948 campaign in Puerto Rico will prove that this statement by the United States Government is simply contrary to fact. The prospective Constitution was not even mentioned until well after the elections were over. The Popular Party platform of 1948 reiterated its position of 1944 — that Puerto Rico's political status was not an election issue, and that votes for the Popular Party could not be construed as favoring any plan with respect thereto. While the Party did not, as in previous campaigns, express itself in favor of Independence, neither did it express interest in a Constitution within the colonial framework. It is true that more than 60 per cent of the votes cast were for the Popular Party, but it is also true that 42 per cent of Puerto Rico's adults followed the traditional independence strategy of boycotting the colonial election completely.

The Constitution really evolved in quite another way. In 1945, hearings in Washington on the Tydings Bill for Puerto Rico's Independence demonstrated overwhelming enthusiasm in Puerto Rico, and within the Popular Party, for Independence. A majority of the members of both houses of the legislative assembly (all Populists) twice sent cablegrams endorsing the Tydings Bill. Nevertheless Luis Muñoz Marín, then and now Governor of Puerto Rico, testified that the very legislators who had sent the cablegrams really opposed independence, on the grounds that Puerto Rico would starve if she were free. He asked Congress to pass, instead, a law providing for an election wherein Puerto Ricans might choose among statehood, "independence" with the United States still controlling Puerto Rico's economic and military destiny as she does under the present Constitution, and "dominion status" with the same provisions. When Congress refrained from doing this, the Popular Party pushed through the legislative assembly a bill providing for a special election in which the Puerto Rican people should express their preference for independence, statehood, or dominion status. This bill was vetoed first by Governor Rexford Guy Tugwell, and then, when passed by a two-thirds majority over his veto, by President Harry S. Truman, on the grounds that it would be improper to allow Puerto Ricans to say that they wanted something that Congress might not let them have. Thus Puerto Ricans were prevented from even saying what they wanted, let alone getting it.

The Constitution, under the terms outlined earlier, is what Congress four years later decided that Puerto Rico could have, and it is the only matter on which Congress has ever permitted Puerto Ricans a referendum. It thus responds, not to the expressed desires of the Puerto Rican people, but instead to the determination of the United States Congress to continue Puerto Rico's colonial status.

### Who Endorsed The Constitution ?

Puerto Ricans were allowed to say whether they did or did not wish to write a Constitution within the bounds established by Congress. They were not allowed to express themselves on any other alternatives. In order to register to vote, Puerto Ricans must first state that they are citizens of the United States (a status that hundreds of thousands of them deny,

maintaining that it takes more than an act of Congress to turn a Puerto Rican into a Yankee) and be fingerprinted. A week before the registration for this special election, the United States Government in Puerto Rico, following a plan conceived even before Public Law 600 was passed, began a series of searches of the leadership of the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico (which advocates electoral boycott) and precipitated the Revolution of October, 1950. More than 2,000 Nationalists and their friends were arrested, none of them being released until after the registration period was over. Of the hundreds brought to trial, not a single one was freed until after the last of the three constitutional referendums had been held, in March, 1952. At least two hundred are still in prison, chief among them being the ageing and ailing President of the Party, Don Pedro Albizu-Campos.

The Puerto Rican people responded to this oppression by boycotting the polls as never before, valiantly risking the economic and political reprisals involved. Universal suffrage (of all who will submit to finger printing and state that they are Yankees) exists in Puerto Rico. A conservative estimate of the population is 2,219,000, of which roughly 48 per cent, or 1,065,120, are over 21 years of age. According to figures submitted to the United Nations by the United States Government, only 506,185 persons (or 47 per cent of Puerto Rico's adults) voted. Of these, 387,016 (or 36 per cent of the adult population) favored the enactment of the Constitution.

Only 405,534, or 38 per cent, participated in the selection of delegates to the Constitutional Convention. The majority of those voting voted, of course, for the Popular Party's candidates who, in keeping with Popular Party policy, had been nominated personally by Luis Muñoz Marín, president of the Popular Party and Governor of Puerto Rico.

After the Constitution was written, with the aid of experts from the United States, it was submitted to a final referendum. In this election only 456,471 (43 per cent of Puerto Rico's adults) voted, and only 373,594 (35 per cent) approved it.

Thus we see that, far from being enthusiastically accepted by the Puerto Rican people, the Constitution was actually rejected by nearly two-thirds of them, with a strong majority completely boycotting all elections in relation to it. That this was true during a period when political trials and convictions and extreme sentences on false charges were in process continually indicates how deep-rooted and immovable is Puerto Rico's resistance to American rule.

### What Will The United Nations Do ?

All United Nations Committees dealing with non-self-governing territories are so constituted that the administering powers (those governing other than their own) and non administering powers are equally represented thereon. As a result, these committees are almost always evenly split on all vital matters affecting non-self-governing people. Even in the General Assembly where non-administering powers have a strong numerical majority, under cover pressures are so strong that tepidity characterizes the strongest resolutions finally passed. Under these circumstances, it is too much to hope that the United Nations will openly repudiate the position taken by the United States in respect of Puerto Rico. It can be hoped,

however, that the United Nations will refrain from endorsing that position. Even that will defeat our Government's objective, which is to gain formal international acceptance of its contention that complete United States domination in Puerto Rico really constitutes self-government.

January 15th, 1954.

### **BOSTON CIRCUIT COURT DECLARES PUERTO RICAN GOVERNMENT NOT AUTONOMOUS**

For centuries, rice has been the mainstay of the Puerto Rican diet — as it has been in China, Malaya and India. In fact, rice, beans and coffee are all that the poor now consume, except for a little codfish on Sunday.

Since the beginning of United States rule in Puerto Rico, this diet has become more and more firmly fixed, as land formerly given to production of fruits and vegetables and cattle raising is now used predominantly for sugar cane. Nevertheless the rice has become harder and harder to obtain, for it must be purchased in the tariff protected U.S. market, where it frequently costs twice as much as on the world market, to which independent countries have access. Puerto Rico's buying power has gone down as prices have gone up. Rice has remained cheaper, and therefore easier to obtain, than any substitute.

#### **Elimination of Federal Price Controls**

With the elimination of federal price controls on rice, its price on the U.S. market went up as did its retail price in Puerto Rico. It rose beyond the means of many families; yet that "something to appease the stomach" was considered an absolute necessity. It was purchased with increasing grumbling against the government of Muñoz Marín for permitting such a state of affairs to exist.

#### **Muñoz Marín's Government Versus Rice on the Table**

The government of Muñoz Marín, even though it claims to control the economy of Puerto Rico, can do absolutely nothing to gain access for the country to the less expensive world market. It is the United States Government that determines unilaterally the framework within which Puerto Rico's economy must struggle along.

Instead of telling the people frankly that it could do nothing to bring them rice at a price they can afford, the Government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico saw in the situation a possible opportunity to win desired favor with the people. It established a price ceiling of \$12.90 a hundred weight for superior quality rice, and of \$12.25 a hundred weight for good quality rice.

#### **The Wholesaler Is Caught**

The joke was that the Puerto Rican wholesaler had to pay \$13.25 a hundred weight for the rice that he must now sell at \$12.90, and \$12.45 a hundred weight for what he must sell at \$12.25.

The price ceiling meant ruin for the rice wholesalers. The situation was even more difficult than before for the would-be consumer, and did not provide ampler supplies of rice.

Naturally, the rice dealers asked for an injunction. A substantial amount

of money being involved, the case came under the jurisdiction of the United States District Court in Puerto Rico, and not under any local court, even though it dealt with a matter of strictly internal economy.

The presiding judge of the District Court was out of Puerto Rico at the time, and Benjamin Ortiz, prominent Popular Party politician, substituted. He refused to grant the injunction on the grounds that the price ceiling was not confiscatory nor arbitrary, and that it did not deprive the wholesalers of their property without due process of law. He devoted the major part of his opinion, however, to the thesis that, since Puerto Rico is now a Commonwealth, the United States Government cannot restrain its actions in relation to trade with continental United States.

### Appeal to Boston

This decision was appealed to the First Circuit Court of Appeals, sitting in Boston, Massachusetts, since Puerto Rico is a part of Boston, in respect to federal juridical jurisdiction. The Boston judges upheld Judge Ortiz' decision, on the grounds that the appellant was not being deprived of his property without due process of law. In respect to the allegedly changed status of Puerto Rico, they commented only that an interesting argument deserving of study had been raised, but that there was no necessity of going into it for purposes of this decision. They did state unequivocally, however, that, since Puerto Ricans remain citizens of the United States, they have a right to "invoke the fundamental guarantee of due process of law" against the Associated Free State. In other words, they declared that the Associated Free State is not autonomous, even in matters of internal government.

The "rice crisis", meanwhile, has subsided, not because of the price control order, but because for unrelated reasons the U.S. rice prices have gone down. Until that began to happen, polished wheat from Montana was being shipped into Puerto Rico, apparently with the naïve assumption that the housewives would find it and rice interchangeable.

---

### 3. PRESS RELEASE

The recent demonstration in Washington can be understood only in terms of the violence which is part and parcel of any system of political domination of any people over another people.

These acts occur when all other channels of expression have been blocked and when national pride, not communist, is great.

Certain facts are being suppressed.

The Office of Information of the Government of Puerto Rico states that four separate plebiscites have been held and that the people have freely chosen their present form of government.

What are the facts?

*Truman's Veto:* In 1945, President Truman stated that a plebiscite should be held in Puerto Rico where the people could choose independence, statehood, dominion status, or their then colonial status.



The Legislature of Puerto Rico, taking Mr. Truman at his word, passed a Bill requesting this plebiscite. Governor R. G. Tugwell vetoed; it was re-passed by a 2/3 vote over the Governor's veto and sent to President Truman.

He vetoed it.

*Constitution:* It is stated that 82 per cent of the Puerto Ricans approved the Constitution. The error in this report is that 82 per cent of those voting approved the Constitution.

Here are the figures taken from pages 3 and 5 of Section C—Information on Puerto Rico Transmitted by the United States Government to the United Nations for June, 1952.

Estimated adult population July 1, 1950	1,024,300
Voting in constitutional referendum	463,283
Endorsing constitution	373,594

Therefore, 561,015 — or 54.8 per cent abstained from voting; 36.5 per cent endorsed the constitution, and 8 per cent voted against it. Therefore, 650,700, or 63.5 per cent either abstained or voted against it.

This unprecedented abstention took place when those who advocated this position were subjected to mass arrests.

*Eisenhower's Offer:* In November, 1953, President Eisenhower stated he would recommend to Congress, independence for Puerto Rico when their legislature requested it.

Inasmuch as this legislature was elected to office by a minority, President Eisenhower's offer is meaningless.

Out of the former Spanish Empire in this hemisphere 20 Republics have been formed.

Puerto Rico alone has not yet gained its independence.

Americans for Puerto Rico's Independence  
March 3, 1954.

Robert Keller

## YEAR ONE OF THE EISENHOWER CRUSADE

**P**ERHAPS the most widely discussed fact in America to-day is that Dwight D. Eisenhower, Crusader Extraordinary, has been President of the United States for an entire year. During a more serene period of American history, this would hardly deserve comment. Amidst the many days that normally make up a year, the public might care to learn where the President hid his Easter eggs on the White House lawn; they might well supply a conventional ovation as he opened the baseball season, bought the first Christmas seals or harangued the Boy Scouts of America to better citizenship. This, however, is not a serene period. After twelve months in office, even the amenities attached to the American presidency have become one

of the most popular grievances against Eisenhower. If it took several years benignly to link Truman with the piano, it has required only a few months malignantly to link Eisenhower with golf. Seldom in American history have the pretensions of an Administration been so quickly exploded, or the talents of a sportsman so heatedly deprecated.

It is not the right of a wearied Crusader to play golf that is in dispute, but the policies of a plump Babbitt who has broken virtually all the important promises made before Election Day except those to big business. Contrary to some press accounts, the Crusader stands ill not only with the vast majority of American farmers, but with nearly every strata of the American population. A recent survey of popular support for the Crusade, conducted with extreme trepidation by the pro-Crusade *New York Times*, reads like a casualty list. New England: "... underground rumbling over proposed changes in the Taft-Hartley Law ... recent tapering off [of jobs] ... if other segments of industry were receiving aid, they [the potato farmers] would like a share ..." Atlantic States: "... [Eisenhower voters] have stated in letters to newspapers that they want action — now ... a growing feeling that tax cuts should be paramount over defense ... working mothers are clamoring for authority to deduct the cost of baby care [from income taxes] ..." The South: "Republican popularity, nearing its crest in this area a year ago, is definitely on the wane because of two important issues — the Tennessee Valley Authority policy of the Eisenhower Administration and falling farm income that has not been accompanied by receding consumer prices ... his popularity does not compare with what it was in this section a year ago." Middle West: "... his stewardship is coming under increasing fire of both friend and foe ... The people voted for a change. They feel they got a change in faces, but, perhaps, little change in anything else ... The friendly press has editorially run up storm warnings for the Administration. The pro-Eisenhower newspapers have been imploring the Administration to do something (or at least say something) to allay the farmers' fears that they are doomed to economic disaster ... Secretary [of Agriculture] Benson's speeches ... have done nothing to turn the tide in his favor." West Coast: "... unrest in the farm valleys is fairly general ... some unhappiness on the Coast over the Administration's power policies ..." From this, the *Times* concludes that the reports "reflect an increasing critical attitude toward the Administration in many sections, particularly in the farming areas". (25th October, 1953.)

If anything, these reports may be regarded as sugar-coated understatements of fact. The week they appeared, a furious caravan of cattlemen journeyed to Washington demanding drought relief and economic support. While they were returning to their homes with a still angrier report that their demands had been ignored, a House Agricultural subcommittee was returning to Washington from a tour of the farm country, its tail nervously tucked between its legs. If the two caravans passed each other, it is doubtful that they exchanged friendly greetings. A *Times* correspondent, who accompanied the subcommittee on its wanderings, described the farmers as "hell-bent" on price support. Benson was soundly "booed" at public hearings in Minnesota, Nebraska and Iowa. "The testimony [in a word] was salty." The farm verdict of the Crusade was succinctly summed up by one South Dakota food grower as follows: "This levelling off of prices will

have us level — mebbe level below ground.” From the farmers’ point of view, the Crusader’s castle on Pennsylvania Avenue has simply turned into a mausoleum.

But there was more to come. Every schoolboy knows that October precedes November as surely as 1953 follows 1952. While this sequence is only a “reasonable probability” in modern logic, it is an inevitability in American politics, even in the calendar of Crusaders. The greatest Crusader of all could not avoid the danger that some of his knights would be up for election, that some public opinion of his Crusade would shortly be expressed. The “salty” news came only too soon! In an October by-election, conducted in Wisconsin’s Ninth Congressional District, a district which had consistently voted for Republicans since the Civil War, the Eisenhower candidate went down in ignominious defeat. Urban as well as rural votes counted heavily against the defeated candidate. With the weathercocks all askew, a deluge followed in November. Despite the drought throughout the country, the Crusade was drenched with a rainfall of reversals: a Republican candidate for the governorship of New Jersey was defeated for the first time in ten years — even with the backing of the notorious Democratic Hague machine; a candidate for mayor of Buffalo, for the first time in eight years; a Congressional casualty in Union County, New Jersey, for the first time since 1933. The same story was repeated in nearly every important election throughout the country. Less than ten months after going on Crusade, the snorting chargers of Crusader and Knights were reduced to a bedraggled herd of Rosinantes! The current deflation of Crusade, Incorporated, is now so remarkable, the anger and hostility toward the new Board of Directors — or “team” — is so widespread, the antipathy for the Crusader so obvious, that it is embarrassing and indecent to behold. One feels like throwing a towel over Eisenhower’s shivering body and rushing him behind the protection of a screen.

The “liberal” press ascribes these defeats largely to the Crusader’s lack of crusading spirit. He is frigidly described as a “do-nothing” President, although nothing in fact could be further from the truth. The art of doing something while ostensibly “doing nothing” is a very subtle one. While it is precisely the “liberals” who do not know what to do, having lost all capacity in this line since 1933, Eisenhower in many respects has done only too much — and this is what is wrong. Failing in denunciation of the Crusader’s real role, that impotent goose called “liberalism” has concentrated its fire-crackers on the Administration’s peccadillos, in each case pointing up its support of Eisenhower’s essential policies. The exchange of denunciation between Democrat and Republican has reached the level of farce: the first accuses the second of a malady called “do-nothing”, the second accuses the first of a malady called “me-tooism”. In the more familiar jargon of American politics, this presumably means that the “liberal” Democrats are assiduously “me-tooing”, or aiding, the Crusader “do-nothing”, or something. It would require a divining rod rather than an intelligent scrutiny of the facts to find the point where Republican policy ends and Democratic policy begins.

This has not passed unnoticed, even in the “liberal” press. A recent article in *The Reporter*, Max Ascoli’s mouthorgan, directly accuses the Democratic Party of towing the Crusader’s line. It requests, begs, pleads

and urges more opposition, humiliating itself like a suppliant before the faint image of a vanishing angel. The *New Leader* is darkly ominous. "The sands are running out for Stevenson as well [as Eisenhower]," writes one of its contributors. "There is a growing demand, in Washington and throughout the country, for him to speak out frankly or forthrightly on the issues which are troubling his party and millions of countrymen. If he does not do so, *others will inevitably and command attention*. In this crucial period, when full and vigorous debate of the great issues of the day is needed for the health of our democracy, the country can not afford an absentee opposition any more than it can afford an absentee Administration." (My emphasis — R.K.) Even more significant than the above words is the pettiness of criticism aroused by these invocations to the dead. Estes Kefauver, an aspirant for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1952, rose to the heights of denunciation when he called the Crusade — "disappointing". Senator Neely probably thought himself a fiery dragon in "lashing" the Crusade for its conflicting accounts of the alleged Russian hydrogen bomb. The Democratic "liberals" proved to be veritable Saladins against the Crusader on a ward level of political criticism, "burying" the Republican party machine but not its policies. This is not a mere political paralysis; it is a political stasis. The fact is that the Democratic politicians could hardly improve upon the Crusade if the reins were in their own hands.

### The Crusade: Promise and Performance

Seldom has the election of a President been distinguished by such brute contradiction between promises before election and practices in office. Some American presidents promised war and delivered at once; others promised "peace" and took a long time foisting a war on the people; still others promised a "chicken in every pot" and at least distributed some bones. The Crusader, on the other hand, has the nearly unique distinction of blatantly disregarding *all* the reasons why millions of voters placed him at the head of the government. Every step taken by Eisenhower has the quality of flouting the popular will, of reversing a compressed desire to achieve other purposes and realize different ends. Although millions of pro-Crusade voters were ready to read one meaning into the Crusade's course, a contrary direction was consistently followed. Like a demon in a fairy tale, while the crowd congregated before one door, the Crusade "impishly" emerged from another. If plaudits greeted the Crusade here, Crusader and Knights were found to be cooking up a stew elsewhere.

Observe closely the dynamics of the Crusade. When the Crusader announces his appointments to the cabinet before taking office, everyone tries to see the Arthurian round table in the best possible light. Even the "ultra-liberal" *Nation* sounds a dubious but sympathetic note: Charles E. Wilson, the Crusade's gift from General Motors, is approved as a man "who got along tolerably well with labor in recent years and has a good reputation as an organizer and production expert". Secretary of Commerce Humphreys is described as "a good augury for the St. Lawrence Seaway" despite being a "thorough conservative" (the word "reactionary", which is more appropriate, is omitted!) and "a good augury to these innumerable businessmen who are counting on lower corporation and personal-income taxes". Attorney-General Brownell is said to be "legally literate and in

professional circles has the reputation of being able and highly intelligent". He is even favored over the preceding, and presumably less literate, Democratic appointees to the job. Stassen, curiously enough, is singled out of all the appointments as a "deplorable choice for a vital job" (Mutual Security Director). (*The Nation*, 29th November, 1952.) Everyone claims to wish the Crusader well and is admittedly ready to enjoy the spectacle of a Crusade complete with flourishes, energy and dedication.

The Inaugural Address in January suddenly rolls over the country in a hortatory manner, marked by the absence of any content or clear aim. Instead of establishing a single serious point, the Crusader returns to the vein of his earlier speeches by calling for "moral stamina", "strength", "faith", depicting the "forces of good and evil" in horrific combat — in short, turning the entire show, to use the Crusader's terms, into a "prayer of my own". Prayers may be seemly in ecclesiastical institutions, but not at the foot of the Capitol. Eyebrows are raised, questions are asked, not on what the Crusader said, but on what he obviously ignored. People are beginning to wonder if they elected a President or a priest, if the tasks of the Crusade have been delivered to a Crusader or to the gods. The Crusade thus gets underway on the theme: what was said about ethics will be repeated *ad nauseum*, what was not said on practical problems will be executed.

*Primo*: In line with this note, Secretary of Interior McKay appeared in February before the Senate Interior Committee and virtually invited Congress to dismember the public power system! The preference clause in the old public power program, giving co-operatives, cities and like public bodies first call on the purchase of federal power, was shrugged off as desirable "if the people want it", but, insisted McKay, "private enterprise has a right to pursue their business". Is the preference clause, then, sound policy? "Not necessarily," replied McKay. "It is a sound public policy that all citizens be treated alike . . . If that preference is in there, you are unfair to some of the people of the states, because they might want to buy from a publicly owned place and they can't." On the future of the public domain, those last shreds that remain of the great American forest before the white man invaded the New World, McKay averred: "I don't expect to change my philosophy of government because I go to work for the federal government." And what, pray, is this policy? Simply that "people at the local levels are better able to decide what is better for them than somebody in Washington" — in short: turn the public domain into plunder for the States, lumber barons and mining monarchs!

After promising "strong government" in public electric power during his campaign speeches, the Crusader exhibited an indecent haste to reverse himself completely once in office. Anchor Nelson, an opponent of Federal loans for power generation and transmission lines, was appointed to head the Rural Electrification Administration (REA). This is tantamount to rubbing salt on open wounds: REA is *precisely* the government agency which lends money for co-operative and government power! Loanable and administrative funds for REA were reduced by \$47,000,000, while legislation was introduced to raise interest on REA loans from 2 to 4 per cent. The Crusade Budget Bureau cut \$30,000,000 from requests for two new steam plant units at Fulton, Tennessee, and \$31,000,000 for other con-

tinuing units. Another measure reduced the pitiful allotment to the Southwestern Power Administration from \$5,650,000 to \$3,736,000. The preference system on new projects was abridged, private utilities were given reselling contracts for government power, and construction on the Table Rock Dam in Missouri was stopped. The Roadoke Rapids power site was coolly delivered to the Virginia Electric Power Company, Hell's Canyon to the Idaho Power Company and, finally, the development of Niagara Falls to a combination of private utility interests.

*Secundo:* Taxes. This is scarcely a problem to be discussed with calmness in the United States to-day. The tax burden on the American people is one of the most important issues in the economics of daily life. About 20 per cent of the Gross National Product is spent to support local, State and national government, including 65 billion dollars for the Federal government alone. Most of this comes from taxation and a smaller portion from loans. The loans, in turn, devour about \$250,000,000 in interest annually, creating an upward spiral of added expenses on funds borrowed for state operations. Taxes are ubiquitous; they are levied, directly or indirectly, on every product in the market, from capital equipment to restaurant services, often comprising the most substantial part of market prices. The rate at which the tax drain has increased over the past twenty years is reminiscent of the steady paralysis state taxes created in the economic life of Rome, two thousand years ago. Like this phenomenon, the bloated tax picture is a symptom of profound inner social decay, of inability to maintain the present social order without an exhausting parasitism that, octopus-like, slowly strangles all strata of the population to keep a thoroughly artificial system in operation.

When Eisenhower re-directed his Crusade toward important national issues, shortly before the 1952 elections, his critique of the tax picture assumed extravagant proportions. At one point, the claim to reduce taxes was so extreme that Senator Taft had to intervene and correct the Crusader, advising the public that a Republican administration could not reduce state expenditures on the demagogic scale promised by the Republican candidate. This is the nearest thing to a responsible statement by any leading Republican in the entire election campaign. A fracas did not develop. Having made the promise, the Crusader apparently thought it would "stick" without rebutting his Congressional lieutenant, and to a large degree this was one of the most important reasons why the people voted for the Crusade. Once in office, the Crusader reneged on all his taxation promises. He adamantly resisted every attempt, notably the open struggle waged by Rep. Daniel Reed, to reduce income taxes in general and excess profits taxes in particular. The Truman tax system was retained *in toto*, with a flat statement that a reduction in 1953 was impermissible. The Administration used every parliamentary device and dirty-deal to cope with Reed, and his proposals were defeated. Once again, the American people saw the Crusader execute a complete reversal in campaign promises so gushingly, vehemently and "sincerely" (to use a term with which every pro-Crusade newspaper characterized Eisenhower's clam-bake oratory) delivered to the voters. "It is considered a crime for a person to buy a vote with money," bitterly complained Reed, an old, unreconstructed Republican veteran and Chairman of the House Ways and Means Com-



mittee, "but what shall we call it if a candidate for public office gains office by making promises that are not fulfilled." This, too, is an understatement: the overly-moral Crusader was revealed as the biggest hypocrite in national politics since Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and in all respects a cruder one!

The "liberal" press and Democratic Party, on the other hand, warmly greeted this reversal. Except for foreign policy, Crusade fiscal policy is probably the most important issue on which both the Crusader and his Democratic "opponents" are transparently in agreement. No attempt has been made to disguise the support acquired by the Crusade from "liberal" circles — indeed, the Crusade has even acquired a "New" or "Fair" Deal ancestry for its stand. It is quite true that here, the Crusader definitely continues the fiscal policies initiated by the Roosevelt and Truman Administrations, but if this is "liberalism" or "progressivism", then Daniel Reed is a Jacobin and his supporters are a Revolutionary Committee of Public Safety. And without knowing the principal facts, the American people have a sound instinct about "liberal" fiscal policies, for it is precisely the "Fair Deal" which cheated them of anything remotely resembling a progressive tax program, assuming a "tax program" is needed at all. The excess profits tax, which is largely felt by the middle classes and small businessmen of America, is peanuts beside the tax amortization policy introduced by previous Democratic Administrations.

The start of the Korean War was an excuse for one of the worst turns in fiscal policy since World War II. In a move that received little or no public attention, Congress enacted an elaborate tax-amortization program, practically delivering billions of dollars in revenue to the big corporations and monopolies. Section 124 A of the Revenue Act of 28th September, 1950, established a "certificate-of-necessity" device whereby taxes for investment could be rapidly written off to promote capital expansion for armaments. According to the theory behind this practice, facilities for war production are "risks" after the expiration of a "national emergency". Industry should be induced to expand at minimum cost, without carrying a tax burden on investments that ordinary citizens must bear in maintaining life and family needs. When applied to steel, aluminium and the basic branches of the economy, this is a patent absurdity, if not outright highway robbery. Considering the fabulous profits made by capital during the war, the absence of "risks" during and after the war, the elaborate guarantees supplied for more than a decade at public expense, the ease with which the bulk of armament facilities can be reconverted for post-war use and, finally, the vast material concessions given to big business since the Crusade started — the "risks" of industry are infinitesimal, if not non-existent, beside those of the farmer, worker, small businessman, retailer, professional, white collar employee and citizen-at-large in periods following cooked-up "national emergencies". At a time when provisions for Korean veterans had reached a new low — in fact, when Eisenhower, *qua* military advisor, expressed his conviction that draftees should receive \$10 per month instead of \$75! — a stupendous loot was coolly delivered to big business.

This practice, of course, is not new. The program was initiated by Roosevelt during World War II, resulting in certificate accumulations of



7.3 billion dollars. When the Brewster Committee investigated the old certificate program, it learned that anything over 4 billion dollars in tax amortizations was unwarranted. Moreover, the scale of operations between 1939 and 1945 can hardly be compared with a "police action" in Korea, involving a fraction of the troops and arms which entered into a world conflict of six years duration. What, then, is the extent of the Truman-Eisenhower amortization program? It will come as an astonishing, indeed incredible, fact that as of 1953 the certificate accumulation has reached 25 billion dollars, or more than three times the amount "needed" to "encourage" capital investment for World War II! What is more, the character of this program is as startling as the loot it supplies to big business. The aluminium industry has averaged amortization rates as high as 85 per cent, steel from 60 to 75 per cent. This is a two-way benefit: a new factory built for government-contracted work may not only amortize its expenses for construction and equipment over a five year period, but may also include the cost as an item in the contract. Corporations thus enjoy tax savings and higher receipts from the contracting agency. In the words of a report by a House Committee (28th May, 1951): "The certificate-of-necessity program is the biggest bonanza that ever came down the Government pike."

How, perchance, are the power utilities affected by this "bonanza"? As of 24th March, 1953, electric-utility corporations received rapid-amortization tax write-offs on 1.66 billion dollars, or nearly half the investments made since the program went into effect. For every dollar a power company deducts in taxable income, it saves 52 cents on taxes. Senator Humphrey (Minnesota) rightly regards withheld taxes or tax savings as an interest-free loan, equal to one-third of all TVA power facilities, Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers' projects, the Bonneville Power Administration and the Southwestern Power Administration. "What a difference from the way REA co-operatives are treated! . . . REA borrowers pay 2 per cent interest on their loans from the Federal Government, and the various Federal power projects pay from 3 to 4.5 per cent interest on their costs. The consumer-owned, publicly or co-operatively managed interest-paying co-operatives, power districts and Federal power agencies are actually discriminated against, instead of being favored. It is the private utilities that are being subsidized." These, kindly note, are "some of the people" whom the Secretary of the Interior wants to protect from the preference clause. What a superb, unconscionable larceny!

*Tertio*: Senator Thye of Minnesota somewhere describes 1951 and 1952 as the most difficult years faced by American farmers since 1939. A more truthful statement would be that the farmers were then facing a profound crisis, marked by staggering surpluses, declining income and falling agricultural prices. Measured in absolute figures, average income had dropped from \$969 per capita in 1951 to \$924 in 1952, falling rapidly in the autumn of 1952 below parity. As November, 1952, approached, the American farmer began to feel the ground beneath him heaving, threatening to swallow the small food grower from the face of the earth. Feeling ranged from deep concern and uneasiness to extreme discontent. The farmer was waiting for a deliverer — and the "deliverer" was only too quick to appear.

Like a blast of hot air, the Crusade suddenly swept into the Middle and

Western States, kicking up more dust on the prairies than a Dakota twister. With flashy publicity men from Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn, Hearst photographers and scribblers, speech-writers from the Luce publications, hucksters from the Kudner Agency, drums, bugles, flags, whistles and golf clubs, the greatest Crusader of all looked the American farmer straight in the eye. There had been some nasty rumors that he was against price support, you ask? Levelling a stern but "sincere" gaze at the voter in overalls, the Crusader put aside his golf clubs, and in a pronounced hoosier accent declaimed these classic words:

"Here and now, without any if's or but's, I say to you that I stand behind, and the Republican Party stands behind . . . the . . . amendment to the basic Farm Act . . . to continue through 1954 the price support on basic commodities at 90 per cent of parity . . . I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair share of the national income . . . a fair share is not merely 90 per cent of parity, but full parity."

These, to be sure, are not Ciceronian phrases. They are not pearls of oratorical talent. With some stretch of the imagination — allowing for the influence of Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborne — the Crusader might have mouthed the words with some degree of spontaneity. It is certainly a shade better than the Crusade's spot television broadcasts: "VOICE: Mr. Eisenhower, what about the high cost of living? EISENHOWER: My wife, Mamie, worries about the same thing. I tell her it's our job to change that on November 4th." Between Eisenhower, Mamie, Falling Farm Income and the Korean War, the farmers voted for the lesser evil, and waited for the Crusader's golden words to turn into a palpable reality. They did not have long to wait.

Scarcely had the Crusade occupied Washington when Secretary of Agriculture Benson began to move against the "Basic Farm Act", first, by completely displacing the influence of dirt farmers in his department with landed barons, appointing figures to the grass roots agencies whose names were anathema to small food growers. Farm credit agencies are now guided by Romeo Short, a vice president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, representative of the estate-owners and rural banks *par excellence*. It is some index to the Federation that the Farm Bureau has consistently opposed federal credit agencies for small farmers, for years attempting to lodge these facilities in private banks. John H. Davis, another Crusade appointee to the Commodity Marketing and Adjustment Division, believes that the price-support program "lacks realism" (apparently, the tax-amortization program is very "realistic"! ) and government buying "could be handled more efficiently through commercial market channels". The farmer-committee system and soil conservation program was seriously undermined. Benson's Agricultural Advisory Committee includes Jesse Tapp, Vice President of the Bank of America, Dean W. I. Myers, a director in several large corporations, Homer Davidson, Vice President of the American Meat Institute, Robert R. Coker, banker and corporation director, Carl Farrington, Vice President of the Archer-Daniels Midland Company, and D. W. Brooks, General Manager of the Cotton Producers' Association.

Benson personally opened the Crusade on the farms with a toast quite different from the dishwater delivered before election day. Addressing a more

exclusive audience, the Secretary of Agriculture expressed his belief that "our agricultural policy should aim to obtain in the *market place* full parity prices of farm products". (My emphasis — R.K.) Now the "market place" is not the nest of the Farm Act; in fact, it is the very contrary! Lest any doubts remain, farmers were asked to "raise our [!] sights beyond the dollar sign, beyond material things". With a pious eye on god, another on the big corporations and the Crusade prayer on his lips, Benson impudently went to work against all the premises of the Farm Act. The spring air of 1953 was thick with rumors that the new Secretary would demand acreage restriction, an old Rooseveltian policy whereby "every plowed field [in the words of Henry Wallace, twenty years ago] would have its permit sticking up on its post". This had long been the most hateful aspect of the "New Deal" to the American farmer, and to expedite the policy, the "free enterprise" Crusade moved very subtly, in fact, weirdly at cross-purposes with the curtailment program. In July, 1953, the House suddenly passed a bill *increasing* the minimum national wheat acreage allotment from 55 to 66 billion acres. During the following month, however, Benson forced a referendum on the farmers for reducing wheat acreage and prepared a similar cotton growers' referendum for 15th December. Farmers producing wheat on less than 25 acres were excluded from voting in the August referendum — that is, close to 10 per cent of the farms in the wheat growing West North Central areas!

At the same time, a terrible drought swept through the wheat and cattle country. "Flying north from El Paso last March [1953]," Roscoe Fleming, a prominent western journalist, saw "a vast reddish cloud that blocked half the horizon from sight — millions of tons of Texas and New Mexico earth rolling eastward on the wind . . . During the wheat boom five years ago it was said that two southeastern Colorado counties had the highest per capita count of Cadillacs of any two counties in the United States. Now the new brick farm homes with their two-and-three-car garages are being abandoned and stores in the towns boarded up, in sad repetition of twenty years ago. Again the roads are blocked with six-foot dust drifts, and snow plows are being used to clear them." For the first time since 1934 and 1936, pasture conditions were the poorest on record as the drought spread into the eastern half of the country. Forced into premature sales, beef prices declined to 14.70 cents per pound, nearly 7 cents below 1952 and almost half of the postwar peak of 30.30 cents in 1951. By October, cattlemen were selling beef for 12 cents on the hoof. The "cattle price controversy" was on. While the National Farm Union demanded price supports at once, the American National Cattlemen's Association, the National Grange and American Farm Bureau Federation, that is, the big farm and cattle operators' agencies, continued their opposition to federal price assistance. As usual, Benson complied with the latter: "Thus far the Secretary has been unwilling to support cattle prices other than indirectly through the present beef purchase program which may [!] be stepped up," avers the *National City Bank Newsletter* with approval. "The American Farm Bureau has announced its support of this program, declaring it to be more practical than direct supports on live cattle." Let there be no mistaken notion that because the cattleman was getting so little for his beef, retail prices had appreciably declined. On the contrary, at the high point of

drought conditions, the Bureau of Labor Statistics announced a 6 per cent rise in meat prices for the consumer from mid-July to mid-August. A decline did not set in until the Fall of 1953, when it no longer could be avoided. Nonetheless, while choice cattle prices fell by 19 per cent for steers, 26 per cent for heifers, as much as 30 per cent for vealers and 31 per cent for calves, comparing October, 1952, with the same month in 1953, retail prices for porterhouse steak in New York City markets fell only 12 per cent, round steak 12 per cent, short ribs 9 per cent and veal about 11 per cent for the corresponding period. Declines of from 20 to 30 per cent in Chicago were only reflected as drops of 10 per cent or so in New York. This did not prevent Benson from consistently playing "consumers' interests" against the "materialism" of the American farmer, unabashedly summoning Tweedledee against Tweedledum, and Tweedledum against Tweedledee, while the tax write-offs for big business continued to roll on without publicity in the major American press.

Not a single favorable word can be said for the Crusade since it has been in operation, not even a rescuing whisper that answers to the most elementary needs of the people. Its policies are more consistently reactionary than any Administration in recent American history. For example, while cancer, heart disease and virus infections mount alarmingly, the "Knightette" of Health, Welfare and Education, Oveta Culp Hobby, has acquired a reputation that is embarrassing even to Republican Congressmen. She enjoys the distinction of having furiously demanded a greater cut in funds for public health, medical research and social welfare than an "economy-minded" Appropriations Committee was willing to grant! This *Walküre* found the *pitiful* funds for investigating the mortal problems of the population too exorbitant for the Crusade. This, to put it mildly, is "free enterprise" in the cemetery! To be sure, she had nothing to say about "free enterprise" in tax-amortizations; "business" after all is "business". The Crusade has scrupulously evaded its promise to amend the Taft-Hartley Law. It answers trade unions with a statement that the "Law" is here to stay. When Nixon, the greatest mediocrity to hold Vice Presidential office in geological time, fumbled this issue before the A.F. of L. convention, last September, he was openly insulted with "horse-laughter" and ironical "applause". For the most part, goes one account, the delegates "heard him in a reverberating silence which would have driven a legitimate actor off the stage for ever". "With ham," said one Republican union delegate to reporters, "you got to have an egg. He laid it." The Egg, needless to say, confirmed the Ham's scandalous suppression of its 19 Taft-Hartley amendments, catching the Crusade (as usual!) in a blatant lie to the public, the famous lie which presumably caused Durkin to resign as Secretary of Labor. After this fiasco, Durkin returned to the plumbers' union and Nixon went on a foreign tour, where he doubtless recovered his reputation for oratory among peoples who do not know English.

Finally, the Crusade decontrolled prices and rents, a measure greeted with stormy plaudits from the press. "To-day [ecstatically sighed the *Wall Street Journal*] the controls are gone and in very fact forgotten. We are beset no more by the fear of rampant inflation." *This statement was scarcely uttered when prices began to rise!* According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the consumers' price index mounted to an all-time high of

115 (1947-9 = 100). A significant fraction of this rise is owing precisely to increased shelter costs, brought about by rent decontrol. While consumers' prices were rising, the price of agricultural products offered to farmers declined by 12 per cent below 1952 and cash receipts were 5 per cent below the same year. The plaudits ceased; editorial enthusiasm lapsed into silence. Newspapers turned from celebrating the deeds of the Crusade to the "personal popularity" of the Crusader, following his golf score and fishing catch. Storm signals replaced laudatory accounts of the Administration's behaviour, suggesting that all was not as well with the Crusade as had been expected.

However, if the Crusade is roundly detested by increasing segments of the American people, it at least enjoys a private audience of friends in the government. Eisenhower has surrounded himself with the most rapacious elements in the land, men, so to speak, of like mind and spirit. For Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Crusader appointed a notorious opponent of public housing, Albert M. Cole; for a member of the Tariff Commission, Joseph E. Talbott, an advocate of high-tariffs; for member of the Federal Trade Commission, Edward F. Howrey, a lawyer for some of the most predatory monopolies in the country; for State Department Security Officer, Robert W. S. McLeod, an avowed admirer of Senator McCarthy. The list composing the Crusade reads like a cast of characters in the "Beggars' Opera": everyone has precisely those responsibilities which he is least likely to execute in the public interest. The government has simply been turned inside-out. If any doubts remain on what the Crusade is for or whom it is against, Year One of the Eisenhower Administration has conclusively removed them.

### The Economic Background of the Crusade

The Crusade marks a sinister turn in the American development, but not an unexpected one. Forces for this lie deep in the economic system where they have been sharpening all the basic problems of the country for many years. To an extent that economic "experts" are little willing to admit, the American economy has had one foot solidly planted in crisis — not for ten or even twenty, but for more than thirty years. To all appearances the United States seemed to have rallied better from the First World War than any country abroad, and to have reached unprecedented heights after the next conflict. On closer inspection, this was by no means as satisfactory as it seemed. The steel industry, for example, which doubled production every ten years after 1880, slipped into absolute stagnation as early as 1920, almost a decade before the Great Depression brought this fact from the statistical tables to the attention of the American people. In this year, output stood at 41 million tons; a few years later, years ostensibly characterized by economic "prosperity", production had increased approximately one million tons, only to fall back in the Depression to 17.4 million. The automobile industry, a new participant, also began to stagnate by 1923, exhausting itself in a brief flourish after 1929, and then falling below 1915 levels in the trough of the Depression. Coal never quite recovered at all, presenting the worst picture in industry. Its history in recent years is summed up in the remarkable fact that production as late as 1950 was exactly equal to the levels reached in 1930: 454 million tons. Certain industrial areas, notably New England, a center of machine-tool and textile

production, were reduced very nearly to rock bottom after 1920, remaining in chronic stagnation until the outbreak of World War II. The great agricultural districts of the mid-West were in an analogous position; they did not even know the "prosperous" days of the 'twenties, passing from bad to worse when other sections of the economy had at least reached some measure of stability. American prosperity under Harding, Coolidge and Hoover was illusory, based partly on post-war recapitalization, economic "aid" to Europe and primarily on far-flung commercial and financial activity. The collapse of 1929 proved, in fact, that the United States was more vulnerable than any other nation in the world, falling back proportionately to a greater extent than the major industrial countries of Europe.

Nothing but fabulous state outlays for war could have pulled the American economy out of the Depression; indeed, nothing short of outright subsidy could have induced certain strategic sections of industry to expand for the "national emergency" of 1941-45. The steel industry is a classic case in point. To put this branch of the economy on a war footing, the Federal government was obliged to supply as much as 50 per cent of its wartime capital expansion, or over 20 per cent of its total capital assets. Huge bulk facilities were delivered over to aluminium, chemical, electrical and machine tool interests as well. With extravagant state support, guarantees, purchases and profits sucked from the public trough, industry doubled its output levels in the war decade, not only pulling out of the general depression of the 'thirties, but from a new decline that became marked in 1938. This has a twofold significance. In the first place, the so-called "recession" of 1938 — actually, a full-scale depression within a chronic crisis — sharply brought into relief the hopeless bankruptcy of the niggardly Roosevelt "reform" program. Although millions of dollars had been spent for "welfare", public works, social security, health and other endeavors to repair the worst effects of the crisis on the people, production scarcely raised its head from the depths before it began to sink rapidly back into a more profound crisis. The total manufacturing index of American industry barely crawled over 1929 levels (110) to 113 in 1936, when it dropped precipitately to 87 in 1938. The situation was far worse for heavy industry. Iron and steel declined from 123 in 1937 to 68 a year later, or nearly half of the 1937 level. The industry had never quite reached the index attained in 1929 (133) in any case. Non-durable manufactures suffered least, falling from 106 to 95. This partly explains the prestige acquired by the Roosevelt Administration in the 'thirties, although it was hardly what Roosevelt or the government was looking for. It also explains the recalcitrance of heavy industry, which followed the Administration with dragging feet and much vocal, although politically exaggerated and exploited, hostility. There is no telling where this downward economic tendency might have ended had rearmament preparations not begun in the ensuing years. Even so, the overall manufacturing index remained below 1937 in 1939, although steel rallied significantly and proportionately more than any other branch of the economy. The "recession" year of 1938 marked a historic test of the "reform" program. From a domestic point of view, it ended in the program's complete abandonment, resulting in a turn toward war. There can never again be a "reform program" equal to that



attempted by Roosevelt in the United States, if indeed any welfare program at all. The experience, once made, completely exhausted itself and all its possibilities in the present social system.

Secondly, the revival brought on by the war increased the costs of production everywhere along the line. Contrary to popular belief, the American economy is neither efficient nor cheap. It enjoys no mystical advantages over Europe beyond the support that sheer physical volume in means of production and output can bring to crass, monopolistic coercion. An American automobile, the most celebrated product of American industry, is inferior to German, British, French and Italian vehicles in every conceivable respect — in quality, efficiency, longevity and cost. Although the motor industry is rationalized to a degree that easily surpasses its competitors abroad, this achievement is at the same time an obstacle to profit: it is precisely centralization of industry which results in staggering costs of "management", an over-sized army of clerks, accountants, bookkeepers, typists, managers, executives, salesmen, brokers, dealers, engineers, foremen, psychologists, supervisors, advertising specialists and artists. All of these and the relatively "superior" standard of American living are added to "costs of production". In the steel industry, a presumably less larded branch of the American economy, one out of every seven workers in the most basic departments of steel-making cannot be classified as "productive". Its capital requirements are tremendous: a 1,500-ton-per-day blast furnace with auxiliary equipment has soared to a price range of well over 40 million dollars. The same story can be repeated for every branch of the American economy. In the decade from 1940 to 1950, zinc costs rose 119 per cent, petroleum 149 per cent, lead 157 per cent and lumber, once an inexpensive product in the United States, 218 per cent. Finally, government taxes alone comprise a staggering addition to the burdens imposed by industrial centralization and monopoly. The most striking example is the motor industry. It is estimated that direct and indirect taxes on a \$2,000 automobile amounted to \$475 in 1950, or 24 per cent of total retail price. This was further increased in 1951 when federal excise taxes on new cars were boosted to 10 per cent of the manufacturer's price. Although the burden is often transferred without qualms to the retail outlet, where it must either be paid out of the dealer's profits or the consumer's pocket, the bulk of it cannot be imposed on the public overnight without causing an uproar from one end of the continent to another. A considerable portion must still be supplied by industry.

The American economy thus stands on a grossly inflated basis. As output and the new swell of production continues, the system keeps moving around in circles, bringing it ever closer to the boulders of over-expanded cost, internal dislocations, a narrowing internal market that cannot keep pace with increasing retail prices and an ever-increasing labor force, growing at the rate of 750,000 people a year. If tariffs, open or secret treaties, internal economic controls, occupation troops, diplomatic pressure (often followed by outright boycotts and embargoes), the "cold war", the manipulation and denial of raw materials (euphemistically called "stockpiling"), vast government subsidies either assuming the form of armament "purchases" or undisguised tribute to industry — if these and other measures were to cease, the most strategic sections of American industry would tumble into



idleness. Whatever "prosperity" exists at present is based on the grip maintained by the United States at home and abroad. "Free enterprise" and "free trade", which never had more than a limited meaning even in the last century, would be an unparalleled disaster to-day.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized, however, that the year 1949 stands in the same relation to the upswing of the 'forties that 1938 stood in relation to the 'thirties. Taking the 1935-39 index as 100, industrial production after increasing rapidly since 1946, declined from 192 in 1948 to 176 in 1949. The industrial index was thrown back to that of the reconversion year following World War II, this time without the financial buffers that had cushioned that decline. Steel production fell by 11 per cent, and this time nearly all sections of the economy declined proportionately. New England was so severely hit that the Keyserling Report to Truman reads like a description of the 'thirties. In some communities, an overwhelming majority of the working population was thrown on the streets. Throughout the country at large, unemployment passed the five million mark, with a conservative prognosis that one million unemployed would be added annually to the labor force. This estimate assumed, apparently, that the decline would pass into a plateau, and increases in unemployment would equal the number of people normally added to the working population. "Fair Deal Prosperity" was visibly demobilizing, despite a precarious seasonal upswing toward the end of the year.

The Korean War, coolly engineered from above, stopped the decline. Notable fact: no public works system was set up; no relief programs were established (on the contrary, in New York City relief allotments were drastically reduced). In place of economic reforms, armaments orders were increased, unemployment was reduced by conscription, and "liberalism" dived to a new low with enhanced security programs, espionage trials, purges, Congressional investigations and political persecution. Instead of a vital political atmosphere, a new concentration camp program was initiated under the shelter of the McCarran Act. Ascending production indices were accompanied by McCarthy, Jenner and Velde. The rehabilitation of a dubious, entirely military, "prosperity" paralleled a concerted attack on heterodoxy of opinion and the exercise of civil rights. This new political program of repression could not have been achieved without the active compliance of the Truman administration. Under the heightened economic conditions of monopoly, of in-crowding contradictions, of impossible output levels for the capitalist mode of production, of over-inflated costs, vast surpluses of goods and a swollen, largely parasitic, labor force, and the growing pressure of Europe on the economic and political scene, even the *thought* of a "reform" program could not be entertained. The apparent apathy of the American people reflected a slow locking of *conflicting* forces in struggle, and a sigh of disgust that was soon to turn to anger.

A periodic return of economic crisis, *all* policies aside, no longer requires ten years. Two or three are often enough. Barely three years after the Korean War began, and only one year after the Crusader donned his mantle, the rockets of crisis have begun to burst on the horizon. Like the Storm-Ship in the days of Wouter Van Twiller, laden with ghosts for the New World, the spectres of the past are making their entry in the harbor of the Mannhattoes — and not even the McCarran Act will be able to

stop them. The "farm glut" is well-known, but in addition to this is a mounting glut of television receivers, electrical appliances, used cars and farm equipment. The fur industry is in a state of full-scale crisis, with every prospect that the entire clothing industry will follow shortly. Steel production declined from above capacity at the beginning of the Crusade, to 94 per cent in August. Department store sales trembled for a while and then began to drop throughout the country. For the first time since the Second World War began, new passenger cars are piling up in dealer establishments, for which the industry has been showing distressingly less regard than usual. It is now fairly clear that increased motor production during the first six months of 1953 was largely fictitious, based not on sales, but on swollen dealer inventories. Whether this was a political gesture to inaugurate the Crusade in a rosy economic background or an attempt to cut down the number of dealers is difficult to decide, but there is no contradiction between the two. Employment levels have definitely ceased to rise; marginal workers are being driven out of the labor force; New York City relief rolls are being reduced at an alarmingly slower rate than any time in the past 18 months. Even the glowingly optimistic *National City Bank Newsletter* has developed a slight lisp: "Inventory figures running through the second quarter [of 1953] show that production in the aggregate was then exceeding consumption. A declining trend, though by no means severe, appeared earlier in manufacturers' unfilled orders. These trends raised questions as to how long the record production rate could be supported. Sentiment has also been affected by economic and political developments. The Korean truce, indications of reduced government spending and tighter money, the drop in farm product prices and buying power, and a general feeling that the boom had run about as long as it could, all contributed to the expectation that the spring months would stand as the year's peak. The stock market has reflected this feeling, and price declines in some industrial raw materials indicate that it is present in the industries." (October, 1953.) The latest issues of the *Kiplinger Newsletter* are more avowed in concern: they frankly predict a "recession" for 1954.

That a crisis is inevitable no longer is doubted by any serious writer to-day. The only question is when it will come and, above all, how it will be "managed". "Providence" must take a hand to see that victims are well-placed to deflect the coming blow against the monopolies. Roosevelt's reform period provided a bitter lesson: reforms necessarily cushion the non-durable goods' industries, small producers, farmers, retailers and like middle class elements at the expense of heavy industry and monopoly. As soon as the effects of this policy were seen, it was abandoned. Since the Second World War, the policy of the government has been the very opposite, marking a profound reversal, not only in relation to the Roosevelt reform days, but in the traditional development of capitalism over the past few centuries. If the Crusade has turned the government inside-out, both it and past Democratic Administrations have turned the economy upside-down. It is the *non-durable* goods industries that now feel the greatest shocks of "recession", rise less rapidly, are given the least amount of material support, and tend to decline more readily.

*This is simply a brute attack upon the American middle classes. It is not*

an accident but a *policy*, which no amount of oratory — “sincere” or otherwise — can disguise. During the war years, scarcely any hesitation was felt in turning the military program over to the large corporations, in flagrant violation of the antimonopoly laws of the land. Although enough gravy existed to supply smaller and less concentrated enterprises with orders, many poorly-situated businesses were simply hounded out of the economy with excuses of material and labor shortages. This policy continued well after the war, even in the disposal of government assets and facilities, strengthening the larger corporations at the expense of the middle classes. Antitrust agencies like the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice either turned their eyes the other way, or in lieu of more serious activities prosecuted small enterprises in harmless fields of business! This was disclosed in little-known hearings by Senator Kefauver, long before the same legislator plunged into national politics with his crime hearings. A series of post-war FTC monographs, exposing illegal cartel operations by some of the most important corporations in the country, were permitted to repose in oblivion. Only the petroleum data, concealed for years, was finally exposed to public attention and judicial scrutiny. The Crusader, however, quickly dispatched even this feeble gesture which Truman had evidently made for political purposes, not only by coming to an agreement with the corporations . . . but by giving them offshore oil as a palliative! Yesterday's sins have indeed become to-day's virtues.

It is easy to confuse these attacks on the middle classes with the normal course of capital concentration. Unfortunately, something more is involved when the government takes a direct hand in the matter. In Hitler's Third Reich, state as well as industry initiated a conscious policy of destroying German petty industry, partly to round out the monopolization of the economy in a more manipulatable form, partly to place the burden of rearmament and industrial consolidation on these, the most vulnerable, elements of society. The Weimar Republic had started on this policy much earlier, and with considerable success, but fascism nearly completed it by the middle 'forties. Stalin's “collective farm” program had the same meaning: the burden of successive “Five Year Plans” were placed primarily, although not entirely, on the back of the peasantry, simultaneously sucking the peasant into an economic and social *gleichshaltung*. While Stalin executed this bloody destruction of the petty bourgeoisie in the name of “socialism”, Hitler's decrees avowedly aimed at industrial “efficiency”, a term that must not so much be construed technologically, as economically, socially and politically. In a steady war against the middle classes, both totalitarian systems brutally amputated the toes of the economy one by one.

With the enactment of the NIRA in 1934, and certainly after 1938, the Roosevelt Administration began to follow the same policy. The so-called “codes of fair competition” of the National Industrial Recovery Act, explicitly exempted from antitrust laws for a two-year period, led to widespread cartelization of industry and legalized cartels already in existence. Many “substandard” enterprises were driven from the field. It is little known that the largest number of complaints against the NIRA came from small businessmen who could not absorb the costs created by this legisla-

tion or counteract the blatant advantages given by code authorities to big business. Senator Nye, a colorful trust buster of the time, raised the principal arguments against the codes, finally resulting in the appointment of Clarence Darrow to determine the extent to which the codes were "designed to promote monopolies or to eliminate or oppress small enterprises . . ." This is the actual wording of the mandate given to Darrow by the reluctant Roosevelt Administration, an extraordinary commentary on the codes! The so-called "Fair Trade Acts" of the 'thirties, which largely supplanted many provisions in the NIRA, legalized resale price maintenance. Although explicitly "designed" to promote small retailer interests, the Acts have since become a subsidy to big business at consumers' expense. But what is equally important, when small enterprises have the advantage in price cutting, they cannot use it. When small businesses try to enter an economic area regulated by legally boosted prices, they are paralyzed since they cannot use the high-powered advertising techniques employed by leading producers to promote their goods. Inflated prices now redound to big producers who no longer need fear rivalry from better managed or cheaper-producing competitors. The Roosevelt Administration was not unmindful that this legislation was promoting monopoly on an enormous scale, but it was very circumspect in presenting laws against the interests of the middle classes, usually sugar-coating the pill with melodious "fireside chats" and "liberal" ideals.

Statistics on the enormous growth of capital centralization and monopoly before 1939 need not be repeated here; they have been brought to public attention by the Temporary National Economic Committee and by commentaries on these hearings. "New Deal" support of monopolies during the last war, however, is less known. Although the Roosevelt Administration had every opportunity to help small business with wartime contracts, it geared allocations preponderantly toward big business interests. A brief summary of the facts is quite remarkable: 30 per cent of the dollar volume of war contracts were given to ten manufacturing companies, and about two-thirds to 100 of the major corporations. These practices culminated a long and bitter trend away from petty production. As this writer has indicated elsewhere: "From the unprecedented low of the 'eighties, self-employed workers dropped to 19 per cent of the working population by 1939 and have decreased steadily in the past ten year period by approximately 1.5 million."\* If we are to judge the "Fair Trade Acts" realistically, it must be regarded as remarkable that between 1939 and 1950, "food manufacturing concerns declined from 43 to 38 thousand establishments, while the number of production workers increased from 802 thousand to 1.074 million, and the volume nearly tripled". The level of concentration in retail outlets is even more striking because every attempt has been made so to orient statistical information as to convey the notion that large or chain stores are not on the increase. The evidence shows that the small store is fast disappearing from local neighborhoods, and is being rapidly replaced by large department or chain outlets.

President Truman, whose career as a "haberdasher" was obviously emphasized favorably to dispose retailers toward the "Fair Deal", continued

\* ED. NOTE.—Robert Keller, *Basis for Utopia: The Outlines of an Economic Plan for a New Society*, to be published in *Contemporary Issues* in 1954.

his predecessor's policies with alacrity. Under this Administration, federal wartime assets were so disposed that 70 per cent went to corporations which controlled 65 per cent of American industrial facilities before the Second World War, leaving small enterprises a woefully disproportionate amount of government surpluses. With the outbreak of the Korean War, the former haberdasher taught the ghost of Roosevelt a point or two: this time, 40 per cent of the dollar volume of wartime contracts were given to ten manufacturing companies, and two thirds to 50 companies! The "Fair Deal" Administration had increased the bias for big business by 5 per cent and distributed two thirds of its favors to half the number of corporations who enjoyed "New Deal" gravy. What was "Fair" was not "New", and both were dirty deals of the worst conceivable sort against the middle classes. Truman's tax-amortization program gives more remarkable evidence (if this is possible!) of the pro-monopoly position of his Administration. Since small enterprises currently supply about 35 per cent of employment in the United States, it would seem to follow that they should acquire 35 per cent of the tax-amortization certificates in dollar volume. Apparently, however, the "Fair Deal" did not see matters this way. According to a tabulation made by the Small Defense Plants Administration, small businesses got only 10 per cent. In eight out of twenty major industrial groupings where enough applications were filed so that small business *could* have acquired 35 per cent of the certificates, textile concerns with 22 per cent of employment got only 5 per cent in dollar value, and small primary metal concerns with 18 per cent of employment acquired only 8 per cent. All in all, 23 per cent of the applications were denied. Compare this with the huge tax rebates received by steel, aluminium and the power utilities, and no doubt remains that the former haberdasher had long since been graduated into big-time operations.

The situation in agriculture is completely devastating. An article by J. H. Carmical in the *New York Times* of 15th November, 1953, opens with the following statement: "The traditional family-type farm is disappearing rapidly and is being replaced by large-scale and highly mechanized projects . . . Since the present [farm] program has been in operation an estimated 1,000,000 farm units have disappeared and the farm population has shrunk by nearly 6,000,000, or roughly 20 per cent." Carmical emphasizes that farms of 1,000 acres or more have increased 80 per cent, and units holding between 500 and 1,000 acres about 40 per cent. As to volume of sales, "9 per cent of American farms realized more from their farm crops than the remaining 91 per cent". Some additional facts may be added to those adduced by the *Times* writer. It is a striking portent of the rate of farm depopulation in the past ten years that this decline exceeds estimates made by agencies like the Twentieth Century Fund. Although the Fund projected a drop of 1,000,000 between 1940 and 1950, the actual decline was nearly five million, or five times the expected rate. In 1920, "farms" of 1,000 acres or more comprised 1 per cent of the units in the United States and 23.1 per cent of the land used for agricultural purposes. By 1940, such estates comprised only 1.6 per cent of the farm units and 34.3 per cent of farm land. Farms from 20 to 249 acres declined drastically in percentage of land holdings, and increased only triflingly in the 10 to 19-acre category.

The most important domestic feature of the Eisenhower Crusade is that it has begun to move against the middle classes, not only mortally, but *openly*, for all to see. The language employed by Eisenhower is borrowed entirely from a totalitarian dictionary. This is true whether policy concerns industry or agriculture, whether the spoken word comes from Benson or Wilson. In April, 1953, Benson made a statement that has never, to the knowledge of this writer, been uttered by a Secretary of Agriculture in American history: "I don't believe that supports should be so high as to subsidize the inefficient. We can't guarantee a profit to every farmer, any more than we can to every retailer." By way of making amends, the Secretary added that "Price supports not only must provide basic stability for agriculture; they should also contain incentives for progress by encouraging production shifts toward balanced supply in terms of demand, by encouraging economic production, and by avoiding excessive surpluses and subsidies". How supports will "encourage production shifts" and "also" avoid "excessive surpluses", the Secretary did not say. But there is no mistaking the implication that he did not disagree with supports . . . for the big estates. Lest any doubt remain, *Time* magazine, a Luce publication, currently regarded as an unofficial organ of the Crusade, dispelled all hopes in the Administration *vis à vis* the farms as follows: ". . . the U.S. has too many marginal farmers (an estimated 1,600,000) who barely scrape along from year to year. Many of Ezra Benson's advisers . . . think that marginal farmers must either be educated up to the level of profitable farming — or educated off the farm . . . The marginal farmers add to crop surpluses, help drive prices down . . . and thus freeload on the U.S."

Now 1,600,000 "marginal" farmers, more properly farm units, comprise nearly a third of the farmsteads in the United States! Together with their families, they number about half the population of Belgium or Holland. In fact, approximately all the farmers holding up to fifty acres of land in the nation would consist of the people whom Benson's "advisors" think should be "educated off the farm" or "educated" to better farming methods — that is, to producing more "surpluses". Turn the statement how you will, it is an open declaration of war by the Crusade against those elements who once formed the country's backbone, who colonized it, filled the ranks of its armies during early American history, rallied to its most colorful leaders, comprised the pivot of Jeffersonian agrarianism and Jacksonian democratism. The Crusade has literally turned against the ingredients of the very heritage it claims to uphold, leaving no road open for the small farmer to travel other than complete dispossession. As Carmichael observes: "According to the 1950 census, there were 4,884,818 farms in 1949 having gross sales of \$9,999 or less, with average sales just under \$2,200 each. Their problems, it is held, would only be aggravated through any acreage restrictions, and many undoubtedly would be forced out of business." From this point of view, let it be noted, not one third, *but more than four-fifths of American farms are being pushed by Benson to the very edge of the abyss!*

If the small farmers face social extinction, small industry has since been invited to join them. Scarcely had the Benson oracle delivered its prophecies for American agriculture when the voice of General Motors began to speak. The cosmos froze to attention! God and man paused in



respectful silence to hear Charles E. Wilson declare: the industrial mobilization base of the United States must be "narrowed" to the most "efficient" corporations in general, and, as later events proved, to General Motors in particular. In all modesty, it may be said that this out-Bensoned Benson! The gauntlet finally had been laid down to all comers — and many came in the form of irate editorial comment, "Letters to the Editor" and, presumably, individual protests to the Department of Defense. Even the High Potentate was silenced; no further mention was made of a "narrow mobilization base". But the Wilson Plan, which simply means that small industries will be frozen out of "defense orders", continued on the second line of "defense". Amidst the gathering clouds of the Crusade, a streak of lightning broke across the sky. On 11th September, 1953, the Department of "Defense" awarded General Motors a \$200,000,000 contract to build the M-48 medium tank. "In Detroit it was noted that the Army decision would make General Motors the nation's only producer of tanks by next spring," acidly reads a *New York Times* account. "This followed the 'single, efficient producer' concept laid down by the Secretary of Defense, who until last December was president of General Motors. The corporation already is sole producer of the M-41 light tank. By underbidding Chrysler on the Patton medium tank General Motors falls heir [!] to whatever additional order the Army may place in the future for heavy tanks such as the T-43." When Wilson insisted that what was good for General Motors was good for the country, he proved to be more a man of his word than the greatest Crusader of all. Although this policy will cost the middle class a tremendous part of its slipping economic base, the country will have to accept what is "good" for it whether it likes it or not.

Finally, a third line of attack was opened by the Crusade's "credit" policy. No sooner did Eisenhower take office when the general structure of money rates began to rise rapidly, with increases in interest of from  $\frac{1}{4}$  to  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. Money became harder, and credit scarcer, than usual. The principal victim of this trend again is the small businessman who must turn to the banks for capital, the little people who are looking for car or home loans, even those who must borrow for pressing emergencies and cannot comfortably meet high interest rates. Large corporations, notably empires like General Motors, are internally financed and, like banks, even lend out funds from their vast money reserves. An uproar over the new policy swept the small business and retail world, growing in heat and controversy until a bloc of legislators felt impelled to take action. On 11th May, Senator Murray (Montana) and Representative Patman (Texas), on behalf of twenty Senators and Congressmen, introduced a resolution soundly condemning the Crusade's money policy. The Crusade countered this broadside by insisting (as usual!) that it was simply following a "free enterprise" financial policy. In the words of W. Randolph Burgess, Deputy to the Secretary of the Treasury, "the Treasury must [!] sell its securities in the market, at the going rate of interest, and not at an artificial [!] rate supported by the Federal Reserve System".

This is patent nonsense, if not a sheer insult to the intelligence of anyone who has the least familiarity with financial affairs. There is no such thing as a "going" or "natural" rate of interest in the United States any more. Interest, like inflation and deflation, is entirely rigged by govern-



ment policy. In January, 1953, the Federal Reserve System deliberately began to reduce its security holdings, permitting these to decline from a high of \$24.7 billion to a low of \$750 million, virtually ceasing to buy government bonds. By May, bank reserve balances fell as much as 7 per cent in a three month period, forcing the "going rate" up as much as  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. To make sure that this policy would not be without a solid foundation, the Federal Reserve System "adjusted" the discount rate in January from  $1\frac{1}{2}$  to 2 per cent. Shortly afterward, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey stepped in, and to the "astonishment" (read: delight!) of the financial "world" sanctioned the "going rate" by issuing a 30-year bond at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, a striking increase over the coupon rate of previous issues. The conspiracy to cheat the American people was now well underway!

The policies of the Federal Reserve System (ostensibly independently formulated) and the Treasury are all the more hypocritical for an "economy-minded" Administration. In addition to acquiring higher interest rates, the banks were given a superb opportunity to loot the public trough. With \$9 billion of short-term bonds maturing, serviced at  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent and held largely by financial institutions, the new policy made it possible for the banks to exchange these for longer maturities at an interest rate of from  $2\frac{1}{4}$  to  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. This increases government interest payments anywhere from 40 to 50 million dollars a year. Under severe pressure, the Crusade *presumably* began to yield and relent on its credit squeeze. Reversing its policy late in May, the Federal Reserve System started buying up government bonds — but not until the bonds had fallen 11 points below par, a decline owing precisely to the fact that the Crusade had exercised no pressure on the Federal Reserve System to support the prices of the bonds it sold. Although the apparent laxity of the Federal Reserve System reaches back to the "Fair Deal", the banks made a three-way killing: they gained on the bonds, on increased Treasury interest rates and on loans to small business, which continued to remain high, thus netting a 5 per cent increase in the first half of 1953. The "retreat" from "hard money" proved, in fact, to be the next thing to an undisguised offensive against the American people in general and the middle class in particular. When confronted with accusations of highway robbery, with a conspiracy worthy of the most severe denunciation, the Crusade replied with its usual homilies. "Instead of hard money the goal of this Administration is honest money," sermonized Secretary Humphreys. "Americans by tradition expect honesty in all things." This is using tradition against tradition with a vengeance. Humphreys could hardly have done better if he had opened Fort Knox to the underworld and let its behaviour be guided by the Crusader's own little "prayer".

### **The Crusade and the American People**

The results of these policies have brought the disillusionment of the American people to the surface, but this disillusionment is less recent a phenomenon than many people like to think. Cynicism, irritation, often outright anger has distinguished the feeling of the masses for more than a decade, exploding only when every possibility had been tried and exhausted. Engineered into war by Roosevelt, the people emerged with unconcealed detestation of its results. The war was never "popular", if this word serves to convey any public sense of a "righteous" cause. It failed to produce a

lasting monument of conviction, a line of verse that was not sardonic, a single melody to linger on the lips of its veterans, indeed, not even a name; only a number: "Two." The American soldier had to riot for his passage home on every continent in the world, and once home, he bitterly obliterated every trace of his "service", from the "ruptured duck" on his coat lapel to the uniform in his pack. What remained were lessons learned from Yalta and Potsdam — later, the naked betrayal of China and the Korean farce. For an ever increasing number of people, albeit still a minority in the country, World War II was an indubitable betrayal by its leaders of the ideologies and claims that decorated its inception, substituting the more complaisant Stalin for Hitler on nearly half the earth's surface. McCarthy has not "revealed" but rather *debased* this completely justified conclusion, reducing an official policy to a mere "Communist conspiracy", and thus deflecting toward past administrations, petty advisors and admitted, but patently uninfluential, Stalinists popular criticism of a practice continued by the Eisenhower Administration. The rivers of blood have dried on the battlefields of Europe, leaving the dark stains of a vile iniquity as the only reminder of the war.

Had Roosevelt survived his third term in office, it is not unlikely that his name would have been blackened in current history beyond all cleansing. The extent to which he could have pressed forward such *hors d'oeuvres* as the Morgenthau Plan is difficult to say, but death rescued the same policy only from degrees to which his influence and technique might have carried it. The policy slowed down in the weaker hands of Truman. For the most part, it was beleaguered by an intuitive popular resentment and opposition, but it did not come to an end. This "Fair Deal" Administration, labelled like its predecessor from gambling jargon, was not supported — it was simply tolerated in lieu of real alternatives. It did not improve upon the policy, but only kept it at a less colorful register. After the Korean War reduced the Truman Administration to carrion, reaction was given a vulture's wings by the Crusader and the stage was set for the Crusade.

The millions of voters who turned to the Crusader in 1952 did not expect him to devour the carrion of the past, to simply grow fat on its remains. This became known only too well to the Crusader in the midst of his campaign. The primary fracas with Taft, in which Eisenhower discarded his uniform for armor, began with a stupid underestimation of the people. This is characteristic of all blockheads and politicians: a disdain for the mass intelligence probably based on self-analysis. Platitude and irrelevancy followed irrelevancy and platitude. Home-spun, non-committal banalities on Life, Love, Gardens, Kindness to Dogs, Cats and Roaches, while adequate to prearranged Republican primaries, visibly began to fail in a national election campaign. The Crusader, supporting his Mamie on a knightly arm, answered to every heaven-sent call but that of rendering the people an intelligent discussion of their problems. He juxtaposed the Ten Commandments a hundred different ways, and conjugated the verbs of the English language without once forming a socially meaningful remark. When newspaper cartoons began to celebrate the fact that the Crusader had "crossed the 38th platitude", when a stadium meant to hold tens of thousands held only a pitiful number of people in one of the Crusader's western circuits, a rude awakening followed. The poor, misguided "serfs"

were leaving the Crusade more rapidly than a morning mist at daybreak. The Crusader changed his tune overnight. He denounced the war economy, inveighed extravagantly against high taxes, promised a quick end to the Korean war, offered better assistance to farmers, modifications of the Taft-Hartley Law to workers, lower prices to housewives, more milk and cereal to babies — and offshore oil to capitalists. When November came, the voters decided to see what “he could do”.

The vote was equivocal: Stevenson received a number of ballots as high as, if not generally higher than, what had formerly been needed to elect Democratic presidents to office. The Crusader was elected, partly because of rural resentment of the Korean War, partly because millions of people who had ordinarily abstained from national elections decided to express their intense hostility toward the Truman “stewardship” with its adventures in Asia, rising prices and taxes. These activated people thought they had little to lose — and even this instinct, in a sense, was sound. The vote for the Crusade was a blunt protest. The General who previously was swimming in platitudes was no longer quite the Crusader who had been *compelled* to denounce the war, rearmament, high taxes, inadequate farm assistance and rising prices to get elected. From a Bonaparte-like figure, summoned on a white horse to the aid of his country, Eisenhower was reduced by the exigencies of the campaign to public agitation — some of his later pre-election speeches are still remarkable examples of social criticism and denunciation — on clearly vital issues. The “educator” had been “educated”, more properly, disoriented from his original course by the people whom he disdained. Cincinnatus was forcibly turned, muttering and cursing to himself against the destiny that disrupts Crusades, into a mere Cleon in a Homburg hat. In this respect, the view presented by Charles Graham in “The Significance of Eisenhower” is sound to the core (*Contemporary Issues* No. 13). There can be no shadow of a doubt that Eisenhower had pretensions to something of a Bonapartist (more precisely, pre-Bonapartist) role. This was necessarily abandoned in the last phase of the campaign when the role could not be supported by a popular “mandate”, still less by the votes needed for election. The Crusade was deflated and twisted out of shape before it could get underway.

At the present juncture in events, the Crusader can only *try* to play the role assigned to him by the vast contradictions in American economic and social life. And when so much is being said on the successes of reaction, it may be well to emphasize the difficulties in its path. Every attempt to reconcile public opinion to the absurd program of the past ten years has been followed by more drastic means of intimidation, an oblique admission of failure. Parnell follows Dies; McCarthy, Parnell; and more recently, Velde, McCarthy. Each is a more extravagant caricature of the one before. Wilson of General Motors succeeds Wilson of General Electric, the heir being less disguised than the ancestor. As the forces for reaction draw slowly together, they emerge from the embroidery of Rooseveltian “liberalism” with the finesse of a mailed fist tearing through an elaborate, painfully contrived spider’s web. The last shreds are hanging loose; they are wafting in the mounting wind of public discontent; concealment is abandoned piecemeal. Even the spider, dead from a cerebral haemorrhage for nearly a decade, is only a faint recollection of the doubtful “good old days”.

Within the people, a molecular but very important process is at work. Like all social turns which volubly "profess" to, but do not solve, real needs, reaction has its own law of exhaustion. For a time, the political summits of society seemingly enjoy a wide autonomy of action, working up a counter-initiative to past gains or achieving all too easy "victories" over earlier, hopelessly exhausted tendencies. While the blasts of propaganda, the shriek of a nearly unified chorus of reaction in the government, press, radio and cinema drowns out the first murmurs of popular discontent, the favorable course of development seems hopelessly to be interrupted by an arid plain on which nothing fruitful will grow. This dessication of political life is only apparent; the deception encompasses principally those who lack insight or are already prepared to meet it half way. No amount of propaganda and mass psychology, not even the mere physical weight of coercion will ever supplant the daily pressure of material interests; no inflation of personalities, however cosy the chats or demagogic the oratory, can prevail against the need for bread, cheese and material security. The overture to reaction may initially produce apathy, occasionally a flickering but tentative "enthusiasm". In the anonymity of daily life, however, the masses slowly collect their experiences, quietly drawing their own bitter conclusions. If the mass media does not agree with reality, so much the worse for the media: growing cynicism answers the fulminations of newspapers and the cries of politicians, apathy shades from cold indifference into unmistakable hostility. As the vast basin of discontent fills, its waters grow dark with the stirrings in the deep below, and before long the face of reaction no longer can see its reflection on the surface. Indeed, precisely when all the elements in the official chorus can be detected, when every voice rings out clearly in the chorus of Crusader and Knights, when the crescendo has finally been reached — at just *this* point, the first snap which announces the irrevocable separation of the people from the noisy reaction is heard over the highest note! The masses, long disillusioned and bitter, finally break away, and with unerring instinct find their own, separate direction.

The 1953 election results merely supply a vantage point for hindsight. The truth is that every action in the dynamics of the Crusade produced its reaction from the American people, first in a fragmentary form, finally in a torrent of protest. When the Crusade reduced the allotment for power facilities in Tennessee, a furore spread throughout the TVA country. Under intense popular pressure, Governor Clement of Tennessee personally hastened to Washington with the warning that the people of the valley "will either have the power available that these steam units TVA is recommending will provide or [by 1956] they will be facing a serious power shortage". With this single gesture, the 4,000 votes that carried Tennessee for the Crusade evaporated over night! The reduction of allotments for the Southwestern Power Administration plunged the scythe of Crusade unpopularity into the Oklahoma-Arkansas-Texas area. Widespread denunciations, characterizing the policies as "give-away programs", were formulated into hostile resolutions by co-operative organizations, local governments, press editorials and correspondence to all sounding-boards of public opinion, from newspapers to legislators. The temperature of public criticism has since passed the boiling point. The most conclusive evidence

of popular reaction is expressed in a poll conducted shortly after the 1953 elections by the Missouri Farmers Association. Of 4,200 farmers asked to express their feelings on the Crusader's proposal to let local agencies handle their power problems, not less than 94.5 per cent firmly expressed their opposition — but *firmly!*

The mood of the farm areas can be summed up not only in the 1953 elections and the cattle caravan to Washington, but in the editorial comment of the *Argus Leader*, an intransigently Republican organ in Sioux Falls, South Dakota. "The Eisenhower Administration should do some worrying — and do it quickly — about the recession in farm income. It is a cloud on the horizon that is growing bigger day by day . . ." Then follows a precious comment: "Economic discussions are usually dry reading, and it is easier to command an audience with remarks about mink coats, government corruption, careless spending and dissension." Remarkable admission for a Republican newspaper — the Congressional committee circuses are wearing thin! Either "read the handwriting on the economic wall now 'growing more emphatic'", continues the editorial, or face a "sharp setback" economically and politically. "Prices aren't made in heaven, and most farmers know it," says one farmer, according to Gordon Roth of the Grain Co-operatives. "I haven't been farming all these years for fun," observes another.

These comments can be repeated over and over again. They touch on every aspect of Crusade policy to-day. From the sweeping welter of criticism, one thing is certain: the American people will not permit a back-sliding of the economic levels any more. Having suffered a decade-long depression and a bloody war which pulled the economy out of chronic stagnation, they are determined never again to renew either experience. What the masses have gained they not only propose to maintain, but even extend. This social fact is very inadequately appreciated by all the political eunuchs in the United States, except those on the summits of power who have to encounter it daily. It is a reserve for coming internal storms that far exceeds the so-called radicalization of the 'thirties, when many illusions still remained from a more stable period of development. The evidence is in the farm crisis itself. Farm income has declined absolutely, but proportionately less than in many other periods of decline in the past. It is not primarily the decline that has set millions of food growers in motion almost overnight, but the justified anticipation that a general worsening of the farmers' position is on the way. The dykes did not have to crumble, their sluice gates did not even appreciably rust before "apathy" turned into aroused militancy and sullen silence into a roar of fierce denunciation such as has not been seen since the early 'thirties. What is more, it is not the major cosmopolitan centers that have taken the lead. Often a more significant stirring is being felt in unsophisticated provincial communities and cities that decades of political description glibly classified as "backward", if not "reactionary". New York, for instance, tends to lag behind Houston, Chicago behind Atlanta, the traditionally liberal areas like the Northeast behind old vigilante country like the Southwest, although in all cases the froth of a slowly approaching storm appears like little whitecaps everywhere around the Crusader's rocking galleon. Yet the journey has hardly started: there is no mass unemployment, the economic index for the first

half of 1953 is *said* to exceed the corresponding period last year, the Crusader has only begun to move his pawns — not yet his bishops and knights. To use the caressing language of the military man in the White House, this is only a "skirmish" not a battle.

The problem is all the sharper because hardly anywhere outside the United States has it become *so* evident that sheer physical production, the brute manufacture of commodities, threatens to overflow the barrel of "private enterprise" and swamp the prevailing social system of profit and rivalry in a crisis of plenty. This so-called "*cliché*" has a greater reality to-day than in the 'thirties, when silent empty factories confronted millions of destitute unemployed. The American people no longer are looking upon an industrial plant slowed down to a dead halt, but one still in full operation, turning out an endless supply of direly needed commodities, a sea of wealth lapping on the threshold of the White House, filling up caves, inactive ships and warehouses, seeping into every nook and cranny of the country — and yet slipping through everyone's fingers into the sewer of rearmament. The system is visibly reeling with the "burden" of superfluity; its knees are buckling under an industrial output of astronomical dimensions. This annual disgorging of goods makes the mind dizzy: 100 million tons of steel, 2.2 billion barrels of oil, 5.6 billion bushels of corn, wheat, rice and oats, 21 thousand cars, trucks and buses a day for every day in the year!

Yet everyone asks: when will "it" come? 1954? 1955? Who will "it" hit? Will "it" be as bad as before? "It" is the economic crisis, in which everyone throughout the United States believes with greater certainty than in the ineffable verities of heaven. The worm of insecurity gnaws through the vitals of the land as the "surpluses" pile up, as these reach incredible heights, casting long dark shadows across the American continent. By comparison, the Crusader's homilies seem like a small mound of dirt, deposited by a scurrying mouse. The economic laws of the system have begun to outstrip the cheap expediencies of Crusade politics. Crusader whitewash can no longer conceal the first cracks in the wall, cracks which have raised every pitchfork on the farms. If Year One is an anniversary of any social import, it may well mark the year when the "apathy" of the people had begun to reach an end, when new social goals had begun to come into focus. If this is so, it will not be long before the people will begin to think about turning the "surpluses" to their own use rather than to dead storage in government dumps. The dwindling bat population, which has been dispossessed from its caves, can then return to its homes and multiply in peace.

December, 1953.



# VIGNETTES OF AMERICAN LIBERTY

## (II) THE RIGHT TO LIVE

Of the entire chamber of horrors now being furnished by the guardians of American democracy, no exhibit shows so transparently the nature and purpose of the entire campaign as the recent law requiring tenants in federally subsidized housing projects to sign a loyalty oath.

This extension of the witch-hunt to the living room is a uniquely naked example of the goals which those who are fashioning the chains have set for themselves. So completely does it abandon any pretense that the "loyalty" campaign has anything to do with that trembling "national security" that its formulators may actually be said to have over-reached themselves in their eagerness to consummate the American *Gleichschaltung*.

When the "loyalty pledge", that product of American ingenuity, first made its appearance before government employees, even those of the liberal school, widely known for their inflexible backbones, could not object. After all, were not "state secrets" involved? There can be such a thing as carrying democratic principles too far.

When the pledges began to appear on college educators' desks, there was a momentary flurry. Was this an attempt to undermine academic freedom? Fortunately, after the first fuss had quieted down, it was discovered that it was no such thing, merely an earnest effort to prevent any new Socrates from corrupting the youth. Any educator is still free to believe any opinion so long as the attorney-general does not hold it subversive.

Now comes the sacred oath for tenants, who may have moved out of slums for the first time in their lives to dwell in an apartment house for which the Congress was gracious enough to divert a few dollars from more pressing needs (the Hydrogen Bomb) to subsidize.

Where is the "state secret" that needs to be defended here? A technique in plumbing, perhaps, unknown to the Russians? Who must be defended from ideological corruption in these apartments — the mice and cockroaches? We offer these hypotheses with some misgivings — they are original and have not yet been seized on.

This being the case, the ideologists have had to do the best they can with the limited resources. Listen to one obscure editorialist:

"... Anyone who has had a role in an organization seeking to scuttle the government should certainly not be entitled to special privileges from that government. . . . The apartments are designed for low-income families, that they shall have decent quarters. Why should anyone who has belonged to an organization on the attorney-general's list of subversives have that benefit?"

Why, indeed, should anyone whom the attorney-general, in his all-embracing wisdom, has placed among the lepers, have any "decent quarters" at all? Is it not possible to revise the rent control laws in order to permit landlords to charge five times the present rents to persons on the subversive list? How about a loyalty pledge from every customer before he is permitted to buy groceries at the supermarket, benefiting from the low prices made possible by the economic system he may be trying to scuttle.

Indeed, the "special privileges" with which some persons in our government are ready to coddle subversives are scandalous. There is a well-founded report that the government is ready to house subversives in luxurious barrack buildings, built with the taxpayers' money for Japanese-Americans during World War II, that they should have decent quarters. Why should anyone on the attorney-general's list of subversives have that benefit?

Some of the tenants who received the politely worded loyalty forms have had the bad grace to protest. Members of the International Workers Order, a Communist-sponsored workmen's benefit and insurance group, behind whose façade no telling what insidious activities have been taking place, went into court to forestall eviction. Their attorney made it clear that, while his clients had yet to be tarred and feathered, the government was succeeding beyond its wildest dreams.

"Neighbors have stopped speaking to them," he reported. "Delivery men look at them askance. They are called spies, saboteurs, agents for a foreign power. There is hysteria in their voices when they call us. Anyone who has not signed the loyalty oath is already suspect."

Application of the law, it has developed, is reversing the old Biblical maxim and visiting the sins of the sons upon the fathers. The *New York Times* of 29th December, 1952, reports from Newark, N.J.:

"A 73-year-old father here may face the choice of moving out of his federal housing project apartment or forcing his son, a legless veteran, to move. The Newark Housing Authority has asked Hyman Kutcher . . . to sign a certificate affirming that no person living in his apartment belongs to any of the organizations listed as subversive by the United States Attorney General's office. Mr. Kutcher replied that he did not belong to any of the groups and, as a loyal citizen, was eager to sign the loyalty pledge."

This commendable eagerness does him no good, at all, however, for:

"His son, James, 40, who lost both legs in the Battle of San Pietro, Italy, in 1943, however, admittedly was a member of the Socialist Workers Party, the father reported."

Kutcher, whose menace as a member of a Trotskyist organization had previously been recognized by his dismissal from a government job with the Veterans Administration, is out to make trouble again. He has filed a court suit against a grateful nation to prevent his losing his home as well as his job. Housing authority attorneys are now working like mad to get Kutcher out of there before he can blow up the place.

Of course, it has begun to dawn, even upon our editorialist, that if Kutcher and the members of the IWO had wanted to continue mixing their dynamite and stealing the H-Bomb secret undisturbed, they need not be above this unprincipled act:

"The importance of loyalty oath forms," he wrote, "is frequently overstressed. The form in itself is no guarantee."

Misses the point, of course, the poor fellow! What difference does it make whether the tenant lies or not, so long as his neighbors have been alerted to watch out for vipers in their midst? Does he drop a careless word, does a letter go astray? Surely there will be someone to dutifully report it.

Or even more to the point: What even if there's no one to report it? What, indeed, if there's nothing to report? Where is the tenant, whether he has belonged to nothing more revolutionary than the Order of Red Men, who will not be careful what he says and what literature he will consent to receive through the mail? It is the old story: For every police agent, there are 100 phantoms who do his work through fear.

\* \* \*

We have a little quotation at hand. We print it in large letters, so it can be conveniently clipped out and attached to an unsigned loyalty pledge, to be returned to the proper authorities.

"MY KIND OF LOYALTY IS LOYALTY TO ONE'S COUNTRY; NOT TO ITS INSTITUTIONS OR ITS OFFICE-HOLDERS. THE COUNTRY IS THE REAL THING, THE SUBSTANTIAL THING, THE ETERNAL THING; IT IS THE THING TO WATCH OVER AND CARE FOR AND BE LOYAL TO; INSTITUTIONS ARE EXTRANEIOUS, THEY ARE ITS MERE CLOTHING, AND CLOTHING CAN WEAR OUT, BECOME RAGGED, CEASE TO PROTECT THE BODY FROM WINTER, DISEASE AND DEATH. TO BE LOYAL TO RAGS, TO SHOUT FOR RAGS, TO WORSHIP RAGS, TO DIE FOR RAGS, — THAT IS A LOYALTY OF UNREASON. THE CITIZEN WHO THINKS HE SEES THAT THE COMMONWEALTH'S POLITICAL CLOTHES ARE WORN OUT, AND YET HOLDS HIS PEACE AND DOES NOT AGITATE FOR A NEW SUIT, IS DISLOYAL; HE IS A TRAITOR."

Credit it to Mark Twain, who never could have lived in a federally subsidized housing project.

MARTIN NORRIS

F. Lohenbill

## BERLIN, 17th JUNE

The June events in Berlin and eastern Germany have shown the world in the most striking manner how matters stand with the rulers in the Kremlin and with their lieutenants in the satellite countries. Had "the West" not been bent upon frightening the peoples with the bogey of "danger from the East" in order to make them amenable to remilitarization — then indeed it would not have needed the happenings in eastern Germany and behind the "Iron Curtain" to make public opinion realize the simple fact that the fascist tyrants of the East are sitting on a powder barrel which is liable to explode at any moment. Western statesmen were fully aware of this weakness of the Kremlin's. But they also were — and still are — aware that the very existence and preservation of their economic system (long since fit for a museum) is closely bound up with the lie about the danger of war from Russia. Militarism is the last resort of a system which, as in the United States, is suffocating in its surpluses in spite of mass misery and, a prisoner of its own inherent contradictions,

threatens to ruin mankind. War hysteria, artificially created, is the patent medicine upon which West and East have silently agreed in order to enslave their own peoples by militarism and prop up their direct and indirect domination over the other nations.

How, then, without endangering the existing system, could western statesmen have admitted to the world that the East has been seething with unrest for years? On the contrary, they had an interest in obscuring the real situation in Russia and her satellites, for the liberation of the peoples enslaved by Russia is a danger to be avoided under all circumstances, not only for the imperialist rulers in the Kremlin, but also for the western imperialists. A successful uprising in the satellite countries would not only mean the liberation of these countries from the Russian knout, but would, moreover, be a signal for the peoples of Russia to rise up against the hated Stalinist system and end this fascist slavery once and for all. And this in turn would mean the end of the miserable lie of the Russian danger! The peoples of America and Europe who are already restive at seeing fabulous sums squandered, would understand at once that war and war preparations are unnecessary; they would no longer suffer an insignificant minority to prevent them from harnessing economic resources for the benefit of humanity.

With one blow, the action of the population of eastern Germany tore up the tissue of "East-West" propaganda and showed the whole world what could be done by the elementary movement of an entire people. Driven by the conditions of life which had become unbearable, and not encumbered with big organizations and party apparatus, the workers, conscious of the sympathies of the whole population, were able to express the unflinching instinct of the people by putting their demands before the Quislings of a foreign oppressor régime. But they were by no means satisfied with having their *economic* demands fulfilled — they proceeded immediately to dismantle the fascist rule of violence. The storming of prisons and burning of records proved that the workers were the vanguard of a truly popular movement which prepared itself to make a clean sweep. Unmistakably stressing their own independence, they called upon the people of western Germany to put their house in order as well. In the end, to be sure, the machine guns of the people's police and Russian tanks carried the day, but this was because it was not a revolution, as the newspaper scribbles eagerly tried to make out (in order to say all the louder afterwards: the Russian oppressor cannot be conquered even by revolutions); it was, instead, the first active step taken against its Quisling government by a people exploited to the utmost.

### Demonstration by Order?

The passive resistance against unbearable conditions\* on the part of the east-German population and the mass escapes into the western sector had reached such proportions that the Russians were forced to change their policy in eastern Germany. The "change of line" was, of course, made in typically Stalinist fashion. Ulbricht was selected for the role of scapegoat in chief. The Swiss paper *Die Tat* wrote on 15th June, 1953:

\* As an appendix, we publish a letter from the eastern zone which a reader put at our disposal. This gives a vivid picture of conditions in the eastern zone before the June events.

"According to a report in the West Berlin paper *Telegraph am Sonntag*, the political bureau of the Socialist Unity Party is said to have expressed at a secret session its unanimous disapproval of Walter Ulbricht, deputy prime minister and secretary general of the party. This meeting, said to have been called unexpectedly for Friday, had resolved that Ulbricht was to face a sub-committee of the Central Committee during the coming week in order to defend the measures ordered by him for the bolshevization of East Germany. According to the report, the Political Bureau, the highest body of the Socialist Unity Party, reproaches the party's general secretary with having conducted, in the past, a policy which was self-willed, erroneous and not corresponding to the true aims of the party."

That Ulbricht has not, after all, been eliminated is to be explained, paradoxically, by the fact that the June events came to his rescue. In view of the open resistance of the masses, the Russians could not afford to turn against the Quisling régime they had installed, but had to prop it up against the masses. That, before the June events, large-scale purges were on the agenda, can be seen from the following paragraph in the same issue of *Die Tat*:

"Mass Arrests of Officials. During the last 48 hours, 84 directors of agricultural co-operatives and 161 leading officials of the administration have been arrested in the Soviet zone. The arrested men are all members of the SED [Socialist Unity Party; the Stalinist-led party of the East zone.—*Ed.*]. These mass arrests are directed against orthodox party officials who have particularly distinguished themselves in expropriation measures. Party investigations have been started against 74 SED officials. The Ministry of the Interior is said to have directed the *peoples' police* authorities of several towns in the Soviet zone to suspend from office all officials who have taken part in expropriation measures against boarding houses, hotels and retail shops."

It is common knowledge that these purges inside the party apparatus went hand in hand with promises and concessions to the population of eastern Germany. The Quisling bureaucrats vied with each other in disgusting confessions of guilt in the mistakes committed. They did their best in order to create the impression that the concessions made to the Church and to the middle classes, together with the release of thousands of people from the prisons, had started a new era. It was conspicuous, however, that not a single concession was made to the workers. Not a word was said about repealing the increases in the work-norms decreed by Ulbricht, which were just at the point of coming into force and amounted to a noticeable wage cut. It was the resistance to these increases in norms which caused the demonstration on the part of the building workers employed in the Stalinallee. On the basis of the material obtainable up to now, it cannot be said with certainty if this demonstration, too, was part of the measures planned by the Russians against the East German Quisling régime. In any case, a "spontaneous" demonstration of the workers, inspired from on high, would have completed the illusion about the beginning of a "new era" and would have formed a suitable opening for a purge of cruel thoroughness applied to the personnel of the government and party apparatus. Whereas the reporters of the western press who were eye witnesses of the events, declare as good as unanimously that this was a spontaneous action on the part of the workers, they have to admit, at the same time, that the Berliners think differently.

In the *Listener* of 25th June, 1953, the report of the B.B.C. correspondent F. D. Walker says:

"The German policemen on the west side of the square (Potsdamer Platz) were not too communicative. How did they think it had all been started a few days

ago, I asked them, the rioting and shooting and crowds in this now empty, desolate, quiet place? One of them gave a shrug. 'Perhaps by the Russians,' he said."

And in the same report:

"Here is another answer, for what it is worth, from another west Berliner. It is exactly the same. The driver of the hired car; a man still young, educated, a former student, and then an army officer, and then a prisoner for some years in Russia . . . Of course, he said . . . everything . . . had been engineered by the Russians . . . to get rid of the east German government."

In the "News Letter of the Third Front" (*Informationsbrief der dritten Front*) dated 14th August, 1953, we find the following passage in a report about an interview with a member of the Soviet High Commission:

"The first question the official of the Soviet High Commission put to me was what I thought about the 15th and 16th of June. I replied, having now regained my confidence, that in my opinion, the strike of June 16th had originally been staged by the Russians. The Russian gave a broad laugh and said: 'We have ordered it! We have ordered the New Course, too!'"

There are, therefore, more than sufficient reasons to assume that the Russians had "bespoken" the demonstration of the building workers in the Stalinallee. A talk with a Berlin woman who is politically active also confirmed this assumption. She said that the demands of the building workers to have the norms reduced had been turned down at first, but that they had been given a hint "from high up" to have another try.

Apart from these reports, however, there are some interesting features in the course of the events themselves which suggest that the demonstrations were, at first, "intended". Thus it is generally known that the people's police took up a completely neutral and passive attitude and sometimes even mixed in a friendly spirit with the demonstrators. If the Russians really had "ordered" the demonstrations in order to have democratic façade, then they were to find very soon that they had been playing with fire and had helped to undermine their own domination.\*

### "Circumspection" in Bonn

And what had the West to offer the population of eastern Germany? Was not this a unique opportunity to support a genuine movement of the people and thus quickly bring to an end the dictatorial régime in the eastern zone? Could there be any doubt that this movement would spread like wildfire to the other satellite countries where the signs of growing resistance are no less clearly marked than in eastern Germany? Where was Mr. Eisenhower who, during the presidential elections, had set the world agog by proclaiming his policy of liberation for the East?

When it really came to the point, however, Mr. Eisenhower had no more to say than: "... we would not think of taking physical [!] measures of any kind which could be considered as intervention." This was clearly and unmistakably expressed. Mr. Eisenhower would not think of wasting anything but cheap phrases on "liberation"; he has given

\*How difficult the Russians must find it to stand up to a really independent mass movement, is shown by the following interview with Nikitin L. Ronschin, the major in the "Red" Army who sought refuge in West Berlin in April, 1953, as published in the *Times* of 14th August, 1953:

"... The troops had originally been ordered to shoot down demonstrators, but in many cases refused. Major Ronschin adduced as proof of this the fact that 18 soldiers, whose names were known to the Russian committee in West Berlin, had been shot for disobeying orders."



ample proof, and not in Korea only, that he does not usually care whether or not his actions are considered as intervention.

Against rebellious *peoples*, interventions can start any time, but never can a politically correct "measure" be taken aiming at the overthrow of an oppressor "government" which is weak both militarily and economically, hated by the people and undermined by clique feuds. For American imperialism, "liberation" is "possible" only if Russian oppression can be replaced at once by American. Every other development, every really independent and libertarian movement is an abomination for the rulers of to-day.

The June events have had the very valuable "by-product" of forcing the western politicians to drop their masks and to confess publicly that their protests against eastern totalitarianism are not worth the paper on which they are written. Herr Adenauer who thinks no sacrifice too great as long as the EDC (European Defence Community) treaty and the remilitarization are being achieved, had no more for the workers of Berlin than unctuous admonitions to use circumspection and restraint. The real mood of Bonn is very aptly reflected in a message from the Bonn correspondent of *Die Tat* of 19th June, 1953:

"At first, there was nothing on the outside but joy and triumph at the courage of the Berliners, who dared to show their fists to the tyrants. The daring feat of the people who, at the point of the bayonets of the people's police and of the Soviet occupation troops, risked their necks for social and political purposes, caused admiration and wonderment here. In secret, however, the Bonn authorities by no means have their hearts in the actions of the workers of East Berlin which, behind closed doors, are being called 'ill considered' and 'irresponsible'."

Bonn did, of course, not hesitate to use the events for its own purposes:

"Influenced by events in eastern Berlin, the *Bundestag* to-day reaffirmed its decision to raise the Federal frontier police from 10,000 to 20,000 men. . . . The Allied High Commission has hitherto refused to approve the doubling of the frontier police. . . . The Government and the *Bundestag* doubtless hope that what has happened in Berlin will have shown the High Commission the need to tighten up the watch [!] along the extensive and straggling borders of the Federal Republic facing the Soviet zone and Czechoslovakia [!]." (*Times*, 20th June, 1953.)

"Dr. Lehr, the Minister of the Interior, also cited the situation in Berlin and the Soviet zone to reinforce his plea for a larger force. This had shown, he said, how quickly mass demonstrations [!] could create conditions on the Federal Republic's own borders with which individual police posts were not in a position to deal." (*Ibidem*.)

### The Social Democrats give good advice

Where the government had taken fright, the SPD (Social Democratic Party in western Germany) could not fail to offer up its "profound" observations. This "Workers" party has many years' experience and tradition in suppressing and strangling workers' revolts — would not its expert knowledge be useful here? In "News from Germany", the English-language publication of the Executive Committee of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, we read the following in a declaration given to the press in Berlin on 18th June by party leader Erich Ollenhauer:

"Faced with conditions that cannot be altered within the possibilities available in the Soviet zone, nobody can expect the people there to take any other stand than the one imposed by the declaration of martial law — namely to recognize the complete dominance of the occupying power with all ensuing consequences for the private citizen, because it cannot be the aim of such a struggle to carry on to the limit against an occupying power which has armed force on its side and

which is of course [!] at liberty and in a position within its zone to use force. It would not serve the ideals that inspired this movement to embark on a course of meaningless sacrifice, sacrifice that would not make sense because, after all, the basic facts of the situation cannot be changed by any German move alone."

This declaration is worthy of the miserable bureaucrats of the SPD. The defence of their lucrative positions has always been the chief motive of their policy. An integral part of the existing order, these faithful watchdogs of capitalism mark the faintest movement of the people that might endanger this system and always place themselves with cynical "realism" on the basis of the "given situation". Always devoted to the ruling powers in slavish servility, they do not scruple to serve Eisenhower or Malenkov as well. Alone the political contingencies will decide whether these will need the services of the SPD or whether they will give it a well-deserved kick as Hitler did in his time.

But how much the SPD is a tool of the East-West community of interests and the predominant power politics, is revealed most clearly in the statement that no German move alone can change the basic facts of the situation. This statement needs to be supplemented by a further quotation from the same declaration:

"In our view the new situation in East Berlin and in the Soviet zone demands immediate action also by the three western powers. The fate of the German people has after all been taken on as a joint responsibility by all four powers in occupation and it is now a concern of the western powers as well to take all steps that appear possible to them, and in the first place [!] to enter into direct consultations by way of their three High Commissioners with the High Commissioner of the Soviet zone and earnestly seek to restore normal conditions in East Berlin and in the Soviet zone as speedily as possible."

It is taken for granted that the occupation powers should split up Germany and hold her in tutelage — but the German people are not considered capable of putting their own house in order. Seeing that the people have just risen against oppressors, the SPD bureaucrats do everything in their power to restrain it from further resistance; simultaneously, they advise the three other oppressors to negotiate with the Russians about restoring "normal conditions" in the eastern zone. But what these normal conditions are like, that is known not only to every child in Germany, but even to the SPD which says in the same declaration:

"Ultimately this example from Berlin has another, more far-reaching political significance. It has become evident, I believe, to everybody willing to see that the restoration of German unity in freedom is vital, for a final settlement of matters in East Berlin and the Soviet zone can only be attained, when, on the basis of four-power talks, an understanding is reached with regard to free elections in all zones and all parts of Berlin which will make the constitution of a free government for all of Germany possible."

It should be realized what a pernicious propaganda swindle this demand for four-power talks represents. Negotiations conducted in public rarely decide anything and only serve to deceive the peoples about the real political relations. Decisions, on the other hand, are being reached in secret negotiations in which alone the actual power-relations between America and Russia and their common interest in keeping down the world's population are decisive. Since Potsdam, nothing has fundamentally changed and neither Russia nor America would think of re-uniting Germany. On the contrary, to keep Germany dismembered is one of the chief pillars of their imperialist policy. Only political mountebanks can hold out to the German people any hope from four-power talks. Such a policy makes the utter

passivity of the German people its premise and acknowledges it as an unalterable given fact that the fate of Germany should be decided by the occupation powers.

### Informative Material

In the July issue of *Funken* (Sparks) we find in an article on "Berlin — Action of the Masses" the following passage which we want to quote because of the informative material it contains:

"Even a respectable paper like the *New York Times* has sensed what has happened when it writes: 'The whole character of these riots, strikes and acts of sabotage in many towns of the Soviet zone is that of a workers' revolt. This shows, in a certain way, that the wheel of the Russian revolution has turned full circle: From Tsarist oppression of the workers it has come to a Communist oppression of the same workers. In both cases, the workers merely (!) ask for their rights and rise up against a tyranny which denies these rights to them.'\* It seems, however, as if the wheel of the German revolution has not finished by a long chalk the full circle of which the *Times* speaks, but still stands at 1918, to judge from the attitude of the leadership.

"We do not yet know to-day what consequences the revolt of June 17th will have for the population of the eastern zone and for the whole of Germany. We read the following in the east German paper *Neues Deutschland*: The intervention of the Soviets was necessary, not least in the national interest of the whole German people [the "Nationale" unites the human race! F.L.]. The events of June 17th had ushered in a new history of the German Democratic Republic, a policy of justice towards the toilers [the "Communists" have, therefore, up to now conducted a policy of injustice towards the toilers and will now "reform"! F.L.] of increased vigilance against the enemies of the Republic [namely, the rebellious toilers! F.L.] and of an even more intensified striving towards a solution for the whole of Germany — and we learn from this mixture of disquiet, readiness for concessions (?) and distortions, how much the uprising has shaken the leaders of the SED. It appears to us that the East zone leaders would have been shaken up considerably more, if the workers of the West, and above all those of western Berlin, had at once rushed to the aid of their brothers in the East in powerful sympathy strikes. If the SPD and the trade-unions are able to gather hundreds of thousands in front of the Brandenburg gate on May 1st and on other occasions, in order to entertain them with long-winded orations, then it should have been all the more possible on this occasion to call the workers of Berlin on to the streets at once. May we for once permit our imagination — which, however, can hardly be expected from "political realists" — to visualize a mass of hundreds of thousands, mobilized by the Social Democrats and by the trade-unions [here the imagination has run riot! F.L.], marching through the Brandenburg gate and down Unter den Linden into the eastern sector in order to unite with the workers of East Berlin in making plain the demands of the workers to the chiefs of the SED and to the Russian occupying power. What a vision, what perspectives, what a tremendous demonstration for the German unity in freedom ... [and that's enough of the imaginary vision of a Social-Democrat-Trade-Unionist plum tree growing apples! F.L.]

"... The west German newspapers could find no end of explaining how much the puppet character of the government of the East German Republic had been revealed by the declaration of a state of emergency for eastern Berlin which showed with whom real power still resided. That similar things are true of western Germany as well, that, of course, is not being reported in the same way. But we did read that 'according to rumours as yet unconfirmed', the representatives of the western Allies and (!) the Soviets were negotiating at an unspecified place about maintaining order in Berlin [oh, when it is question of 'order', then 'four-power conferences' run off like clockwork! F.L.]. The Soviets are said to have inspired these talks in order to make sure that, after emergency rule has been abolished in eastern Berlin, the western Allies will also (!) do everything to assure law and order [the supreme 'Soviet' demand! F.L.] at the focal points

\* Re-translated from the German; exclamation mark inserted by *Funken*. (Ed.)

of the uprising along the sector boundary so that no more crowds shall collect there. (*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* of June 20th, 1953). And as reported in connection with this, the western allied Command has promptly ordered the Berlin senate that, in view of the situation, the Allied Command be informed in time of every meeting in the western sectors and their permission obtained. Those with whom real power still resides, both in the West and the East, appear to have a better understanding of the possibilities of the situation than the leadership of the SPD, and they act according to their interests, in contrast to the leaders of the SPD [quite wrong: the interests of the *leaders* of the SPD and of the trade-unions are deeply entrenched in the existing state apparatus and coincide with those of the holders of real power whose agents they are! F.L.J.]”

### The "Liberator" fails to liberate !

In the "western allied" countries, there was as much disquiet as in Bonn. From Moscow to Washington, everybody agreed that the main task consisted in bringing the population of eastern Germany "to see reason". In the House of Commons, the wise restraint shown by the Russians in their dealings with the population of eastern Germany was praised; and this statement soon was taken up by the politicians of the West and was even echoed unthinkingly by German politicians who consider themselves as progressive. Dr. Heinemann of the GVP (All-German People's Party), for instance, calls strikes and demonstrations of unarmed workers violence by which *nothing* could be achieved; tanks and machine guns sent against unarmed crowds, on the other hand, are not called brute force used by a foreign oppressor, but "wise restraint".

Two significant quotations will show the cynically outspoken attitude taken up in the West towards the Berlin events. The *Economist* of 27th June says:

"... For example, there are those who preach the doctrine of liberation of the satellites. But the impossibility of carrying a policy of liberation beyond the stage of talk has been sharply illumined by the events of the last ten days in the Soviet zone of Germany. For the first time, there has been open revolt in a Soviet satellite. Moreover, it has happened in full view of western observers, with American, British and French troops close at hand. If there is anything in 'liberation', was not this the golden opportunity for action? But what action? And the answer surely is that no action was possible. The Berlin riots are a propagandist's god-send; they should be exploited to the full in what is *said*. But it is clear that nothing could have been *done* without running the real risk of immediate war."

This is supplemented by the following quotation from the *New Statesman and Nation* of 27th June, 1953:

"The question is: what next? In this journal, we have steadfastly set our face against the policy of 'liberation'. No one has the right to incite the peoples of eastern Germany or the rest of eastern Europe to revolt, unless he is prepared to sustain their struggle with something more effective than propaganda speeches. Are we ready to see British and American tanks cross the frontier into eastern Germany? If we are not, our message to the eastern workers must be one of caution and restraint. What they long for is an end of the miserable satellite régime under which they live, and of the cold war which prevents the unification of their country. But the only way that these objectives can be peacefully achieved is by free elections throughout Germany. And for such elections to take place, what is necessary is not incitement to violence against the Russians but the resumption of Four-Power negotiations."

That is how it is: With words and propaganda, the West is quickly at hand — but when the peoples start taking their destiny into their own hands, the co-operation of the western and eastern imperialists becomes clear and a deep-rooted community of interests becomes visible behind the noisy propaganda which is so useful to both sides. This is an insight which,

according to the London *Observer*, is spreading among the people of eastern Berlin who compare the Western attitude towards the events in east Germany with the waiting tactics of the Russian army during the Warsaw uprising in the second world war.

Mr. Eisenhower, who had assured the press reporters that he did not think of intervening physically, has meanwhile thought of another propaganda trick and has started a food parcel action. This does not mean that the president of the United States has suddenly resolved to come to the aid of the population of eastern Germany — it means only that Eisenhower wants to make propaganda for his government's policy and that he wants to prop up Herr Adenauer. The miserly gift of 15 million dollars (less than one dollar per head of the population of eastern Germany) is meant to deceive the peoples of the world who did not show the slightest sympathy for the policy of sitting on the fence and expected deeds instead of empty words. In view of the immense quantities of surplus food rotting in American warehouses, 15 million dollars worth more or less make no difference — as long as this action does not fail in its *propaganda* purpose and does no harm to the satellite régime in eastern Germany! The population of eastern Germany, however, reacted to this propaganda gesture more promptly and violently than had been expected, and already one hears "Western" voices to the effect that this action should never have been started since the people had reacted like "wild animals" and had got completely out of hand.\*

Thus even Eisenhower's stingy and calculated parcel distribution aroused the people of the eastern zone to register their protest by undertaking journeys from all parts in spite of prohibitions and threats; this shows how easily the rulers of America could break down the Iron Curtain if they really wished to do that. Instead of wasting fantastic wealth upon armaments, they need only produce "peace goods" and send them, together with the surpluses, into the economic channels available to them. That would create in the "western world" a prosperity such as never existed before, and it would open up economic perspectives before the "eastern" peoples and would be a direct stimulus to them to do away with the incubus of totalitarianism.

In western Germany, however, everybody ought to understand that the way to the liberation of eastern Germany does not lead through remilitarization but, on the contrary, through the struggle against it. If this is conducted successfully, then Europe will have to break out of the Russo-American stranglehold and will stimulate the American people as well to tackle their own problems instead of exporting them. And then only will the business community of America and Russia come to an end and be relegated to its proper place in the lumber room of history.

#### Appendix: A Letter from Berlin

Dear Friends,

Berlin, May 5th, 1953.

I have chosen a different way this time to report about ourselves. First,

\* Since the German elections, not much has been heard of Mr. Eisenhower's food parcel action. Now clothing parcels are planned, but the clothes are to be distributed in a less "dramatic" way than the food — they are to go through the traditional channels such as charitable societies, etc., and public funds are not to be used.

on the situation — I have been in a position to write to you only sporadically and incompletely.

Politically and economically, the situation gets more and more tense. All parties follow the same line: unconditional capitulation before the SED line. The trade-unions are merely an apparatus to squeeze the last bit out of the workers. In addition, they run a holiday service similar to "Strength through Joy". To stick to this point: The trade-unions first started by repealing the occupation law according to which all employees could be elected shop stewards. Now, only trade-union members can be elected — the shop stewards no longer represent the interests of the workers, but those of the State. This year, for instance, on May 1st, they have co-operated in all factories to increase the norms "voluntarily", that is, to cut wages. In some phases of production, this has led to wage cuts of up to 50 per cent. The average is about 15 per cent to 25 per cent. Only piece work is to be done; time wages are reactionary. The tempo of work has been increased so far, particularly in state factories, that the question of pensions will soon be settled. As a rule, the worker cannot survive until he is 65. Welfare relief is mostly being stopped for those who have a family or relatives. These have to keep them, including even sons-in-law. If they do not do so, then it is the poor devils themselves who have to go to law. Voluntary contributions to sickness and old-age insurance have been increased by several 100 per cent. "Socialization" has begun on a comprehensive scale. Farmers are being set so high a delivery quota that they can see beforehand how soon they will have got to the end of their tether. Then they will be arrested as saboteurs. Small factories, all private industry including workshops with two men only, have been put into the highest tax category. If profits exceed DM. 4,000 per annum, social contributions cannot be deducted. That means that taxes are being increased so that the business hardly yields anything. In addition, the owner must not take out more than he has earned in any one year. He must not live on his substance! If, as happens frequently, taxes go very nearly to this limit, then he has hardly anything left to live on. On what he takes out of his substance, he has to pay 25 per cent tax — the state participates to one-fourth.

Artisans are an exception if they do not employ more than five people. But all those who have a retail shop, wholesale business, etc., no longer get ration cards. They have to buy in the state shops. In these, however, neither butter nor margarine nor sugar are obtainable, cooking fat and bacon but rarely. So all these people have to go without fats. Apart from this, the less well-to-do are very hardly hit: profit margins are so small that in most cases part of the family has to work in a factory in order to get by. Attacks on the Church, particularly on the Youth Community, are very severe. Compulsion is much more marked than it was under the Nazis. High-school pupils are being expelled from school, workers in offices or factories victimized or dismissed if they stay in the Youth Community. Now attacks begin against the Church as a whole. Unbelievable lies and distortions are being used. Grovelling and byzantinism in the SED have reached heights one would not think possible in a "workers'" party. Much has been copied from the Church. Hymns to Stalin, adoration of the god Party or of Stalin — even liturgical formulae have been taken



over. Artistically, things are in a terrible state — as they were under Hitler in architecture and painting. It is enough to make one cry! My time is up.

Yours, H.

---

R. N. Petrov

## THE PEACE CAMPAIGN\*

THE Soviet "Peace Campaign", originally invented for the limited purpose of serving a few internal objects of the Soviet police, springs from political premises utterly incompatible with all western political thought whatsoever, the bygone fascist devices included.

It is plainly a weird invention of a powerful and politically illiterate boor. That this invention should have been exported to the West on the one hand testifies only to the fact that the boor is not confined to his geopolitical precincts; and on the other is a striking proof of an illiterate lack of discrimination between his feelings and western notions.

An illiterate, as well as a drunkard, reckons that all others share his excitements and limited point of view. Unless consideration is given to this psychological factor, the Soviet "Peace Campaign", as flaunted before the West, cannot be explained.

Now, for an overall elucidation of a long-muddled and needlessly controversial issue: the Soviet government neither needs nor wants a war, but the Soviet people, and particularly the peoples of the Soviet satellite countries, do so very much. If one fails to grasp this idea, one shows a very low political education. Prepared continually for any possible further imperialist acquisition without risk of an armed conflict, the Soviet government shuns at all costs every occasion for a major showdown, especially where this would involve a powerful opponent. The whole position is strikingly clear. The highly advantageous supremacy of the Soviet ruling class, based, as it is, on an unheard-of economic and social inequality, can be fully exercised only without external interference or the necessity for keeping under arms an enormous portion of the subjugated society. The smallest armed conflict, affecting the Soviet state machinery, must immediately be reflected in the curtailment of the free hand enjoyed by bureaucratic rule. This happens not only through a rapid rise to various grades of military rank of the better elements of the population, those who still yesterday had nothing to say; but also over the whole range of technical arrangements and in the economic sphere the blockhead bureaucracy has to relinquish its sway in favour of the actual brains, those

\* This article was written in the first half of 1952. Despite the fact that the "peace campaign" in the West has now somewhat abated, we believe Mr. Petrov's analysis will still be of interest to readers of *Contemporary Issues* revealing as it does one more facet of Stalinist barbarism.—Ed.

kept in the background in peace-time. In this respect a comparison with Nazi Germany is of some significance. A vast bulk of Hitlerite upstarts, both in the Party and in all sections of the administration, were not in favour of an open clash with the allied West. It was only through the at once shameful and bloodless yielding of one territory after another to them by the Western cabinets, that this large pack of under-mediocrities was given the opportunity to exercise its rule for so many years over the nation with the highest civilization in the world. To this pack bloodthirsty Hitler and the ever-bellicose *Reichswehr* were a greater menace than all the allies put together. But it is just here that our comparison between the two countries ends abruptly. Stalin, his *Politburo* and his bemedalled marshals do not want any risky wars! They are completely reliable agents of the Soviet ruling class.

The same cannot be said about the Soviet people — we regret to inform enlightened Western politicians. The Soviet people's only dream is of a major war that might break out even to-night! Not only to feed their only hopes for whatever changes a future clash with the West might bestow on them, but also for the very sake of human living conditions during *a war* (!), do the Soviet subjects long for one to come. Now, let us once more help the "first hand" connoisseurs of Soviet reality.

During the war the Soviet people were better fed and clothed; they spontaneously regained freedom of speech for the first time since roughly 1928; they enjoyed freedom of movement all over the country; they ceased to be the subject of daily victimization by foremen, overseers, petty provocateurs and the *NKVD* itself; had their say over the management and arrangements in the widest range of state and co-operative enterprises, a privilege eagerly accorded them by the bureaucracy itself. Let us take part by part this, to any Western mind, surely astonishing assertion about the Soviet war-time reality.

The Soviet administration maintains continuously enormous reserves not only of basic foodstuffs, but also of a whole range of better-grade nutritive items both for the top layers of the bureaucracy and for export. With exports abruptly cut off, and a bestial fear of the "internal enemy", the Soviet government resolved at once upon a liberal distribution of existing stocks of provender, relinquishing altogether its old cretinous engineering of "good communism" through want and hunger. Distribution from clothing centres was for the first time opened to all. A *talon*-voucher, hitherto issued by factory management or a local party committee to their well-tested stooges, was no longer in evidence. With popular feelings running high, no bureaucratic organ, or its favourite scab, would have dared to claim privileged treatment. In the districts abandoned before the approaching enemy all state stores were given away for nothing; the cattle in *kolkhozes* and *sovkhozes* was slaughtered for since long unknown human consumption. The same was true of all other districts of the country. Unauthorized slaughter of the registered livestock, for the reasonable satisfaction of consumption needs, was winked at by the authorities. A justifiable taking away of small items for consumption purposes by employees no longer involved persecution and imprisonment. The few mentioned features of Soviet "freedom", anomalous and peculiar as they might appear in the eyes of Western Europeans, did not have any detri-

mental repercussions on the Soviet economy either as a whole or in any of its branches. Experiencing an enlarged portion of his personal freedom the Soviet citizen doubled his efforts to help the country. True, the old-standing bureaucratic muddle was still unabated here and there. By virtue of this, in spite of the fact that a good deal of yesterday's police gag had been done away with, even the armed forces had, on their way to the fronts, to line-up now and then for a 400 grammes emergency lump of black bread, otherwise issued to the civilian population. But even this feature speaks for itself: no emergency measures were ever undertaken in peace-time to alleviate the Soviet mortal's lot in any circumstances.

What freedom of speech and movement means to the Russian folk one can appreciate only by being oneself one of them or by understanding thoroughly the Russian soul. A wild and spontaneous urge to speak their minds in the open overpowered literally the whole population before the last words of Molotov's broadcast died on the air on the 22nd June, 1941. Before he finished his grim appeal to the country, billions of curses were sent in the direction of the Kremlin. This is no exaggeration! Any one of the many hundred of thousands of ex-Soviet citizens now living in the Western world will confirm our account. Without for a moment stopping over any analysis of the whole situation, the Soviet subject had cast his wildest curses on everything recalling Stalinist rule. Stalin himself invariably topped the long roll of damnation. The language the Soviet subject had subsequently in store throughout the war would have been unthinkable in any of its variety before the war. The number of those using it was far too great for the panic-stricken authorities to risk their skin in a counter-action. Propaganda meetings, for an extra war effort, were most often spontaneously turned into anti-government demonstrations with condemnation of the past friendship with German fascism as their chief motif. Further, the Soviet human being had regained a freedom of movement throughout the immense land. Although the tied-bench and the labour-book were not abolished, nevertheless a militia man or an *NKVDist*, approaching an innocent traveller to check his personal papers, immediately became the centre of a hostile crowd of such dimensions that the first to flee from the awkward situation before becoming the loser, was as a rule the armed symbol of authority. The arrests made were very few. An emergency system in operation throughout the country, of either catering for or supplying needed provisions to the "refugees" was above all of great help to the countless strays. State-owned combines, ever hungry for additional manpower, were only too eager to forget to ask any newcomers for release papers from previous employment. Local provocateurs, stool-pigeons and stooges, categories recognizable only by custom and not by distinctions or visible ranks, had to climb down before any newcomers, *lettoons*\* and newly shifted masses alike. Before long almost all scabs had become inoffensive to the toilers at large. Foremen, overseers, and particularly directors and managers, turned overnight into the sweetest creatures. To escape facing martial law and all the responsibility for their inefficiency, well covered by party relations throughout the peace years, the bureaucratic bosses were withdrawing *en masse* into the background. Leading posts in the armed forces, in economic departments and at industrial estab-

\* *Lettoon*: a Soviet hobo — a bureaucratic invention for the purpose.

lishments were most eagerly bestowed upon the "unconnected" specialists.

A large part of this war-time Soviet picture, the authenticity of which we repeat can be checked at will with the sources available on the spot, has already faded. If however to this image, which was itself already taken by the Russians for a foreshadowing of some brighter future, are added inflated declarations of good things to come, thrown left and right in the days of war by Stalin, Molotov and a swarm of lesser caciques, then one may perhaps realize through what different glasses the Russian masses looked at the phenomenon of the war. In fact the past war, throughout its duration, spelled for them every hope for a decent to-morrow — irrespective of the outcome of the bloody struggle itself. With the old terror and an obtuse bureaucratic control getting back into their grip the post-war life, the Soviet subject began to understand his lost chance. The progressive deterioration in relations between the former anti-Nazi allies had already by 1948 acquired such imminent war-like configuration that the dwindling flame of hope began to regain its intensity. Chiefly with the help of the official unintelligent and self-harming Soviet publicity, and foreign broadcasts in Russian (accessible to an insignificant portion of the Soviet population, to be sure), the Soviet masses grasped the real situation. When the home gossip about a fresh war, this time with the Western bloc, reached large proportions, and popular feelings began once again to run high, the Kremlin decided to check the contagious disease. Herein is the origin of the so-called Soviet "peace campaign".

Resorting to its well-tested terrorist method, by which the Soviet population is called upon either to sign *en masse* some public declarations or to participate in open demonstrations, or both, for the unerring detection of those who fail to respond, and simultaneously for a radical wiping out of any oppositional call of the day, the Soviet government already in 1948 began its "peace campaign". It was going on in the Soviet Union ("a bulwark of world peace") for a good year without its organizers having the slightest intention of exporting the grim operation to the "warmongering Western imperialists". Not many in the West, significantly not the Pollitts, Thorezes and the like, were aware of this latest "hit" which had been running for some considerable time on the Soviet stage. Playing solo for almost a year the Soviet radio was daily broadcasting reports of ever growing ranks of "peace partisans", giving with typical illiterate zeal all the fresh counts up to the latest figure coming from all corners of the Soviet Union and the satellite countries. Soon the *Gosplan* joined the scene. A neo-Stakhanovite exploitation screw was set in train. The "peace partisans" began to undertake the "peace guards" (*vakhhta mira*) or, more comprehensibly, "pledges for higher output" in a murderous tempo of increased daily working norms. To emphasize it again: for almost the whole of the first year of this purely internal Soviet jumble, the Kremlin did not care a bit what the Western "warmongers" had to say about the "peace". To crush the local "warmongers", unaffected hitherto by all the official tricks, the Soviet government finally in March, 1951, introduced Draconian law, with severe penalties, including the death penalty, against war gossip. The satellite régimes followed suit without delay.

Flabbergasted by its internal police success, the Soviet government arrived apparently at the conclusion that western societies might also feel

happy with their "peace campaign", whereby one more nail in the coffin of Soviet popular hopes might be flaunted before the public at home. Beginning with the "Stockholm Peace Conference", many more similar strange gatherings were organized in the West by the local branches of Stalinism. All were scrupulously reported by all organs of Moscow propaganda. The day the London *Daily Worker* reported in five lines that only six people out of over a thousand had voted against a "peace resolution" carried and adopted at the speakers' corner in Hyde Park, Moscow radio on the same day during its 11.30 p.m. news service (the longest news service of the day) repeated the triumphant message giving the whole five lines complete with punctuation.

Misinformation by its regular informants, the western Stalinists and intellectual fellow-travellers — themselves in turn both isolated politically in their own societies, and unqualified ignoramuses of Soviet reality — the Soviet government prompts only to more and more "peace campaigns" in the West. Certainly one cannot suspect the Kremlin keepers of having even a moment's clear understanding of the fact that their "peace efforts" in the West neither hamper the Governments of the West in the carrying out of their own utterly different means of arranging matters; nor make the slightest impression on the practical indifference of the generality of people in the West.

---

## THE SOCIETY FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN SCIENCE GROWING — NOT DYING :

A Rejoinder to P. M. by Victor Paschki, Vice President of the S.S.R.S.

P.M.'s Post Mortem, in the May-June issue of *Contemporary Issues*\* was quite a surprise. Fortunately, P.M. is very wrong. The Society for Social Responsibility in Science (S.S.R.S.) is not only not, as P.M. surmises, a corpse, but rather a vividly growing organism. In addition to increasingly successful work in bringing the ideas of the S.S.R.S. before the scientific community, work on constructive alternatives is growing apace. Present activities in this field include consultation for agencies working in the field of rehabilitation, development of small tools, suitable for use in underdeveloped countries: plans for setting up research projects for study and training of technical people from other countries are in the stage of development.

P.M.'s difficulties with the S.S.R.S. stemmed probably from a misconception on his part regarding the meaning of "co-operation". His "note"

\* Volume 3, Number 11, Summer, 1952. [Mr. Paschki's statement was received in February 1953.]

conveys the idea that two groups (*Contemporary Issues* being presumably one, and the S.S.R.S. the other) get together to find points of common interest for working together, leaving possibly other parts of their concerns outside the common pool. This, of course, was not the case. P.M. and a friend of his applied as associate member and as member respectively of the S.S.R.S., and after being accepted, P.M. started an attempt of bending the S.S.R.S. to what *he* felt should be done. He thought (see his picture of the man "buying a dog", and then having to do all the barking himself!) that he had "bought" the S.S.R.S. Since that was not so, how much barking did he have to do, poor P.M.; he must still be hoarse, judging from his 'Follow-up'.

In order to avoid lengthy discussions only two brief comments on P.M.'s "sample details" will be given.

The case of the New York anthropologists is interesting, because apparently P.M. regards a protest by a relatively small group a "constructive alternative". But apart from that, there are so many things that a liberal person wishes to protest against, that a seclusion is obviously necessary. And in case of group action one important point must be the relevance of the case for the group. If the S.S.R.S. would protest every violation of civil liberties which comes to its attention, no time would be left for work on constructive alternatives to which P.M. pays at least lip service.

The second case — that of a letter of Hans Bethe, has several aspects. Bethe, as many other scientists, takes the attitude that society has the right to control the work of scientists. He combines with this view (with which the writer disagrees completely) a deep concern about the implications of the hydrogen bomb (which concern the writer shares). Out of this position Bethe arranged some years ago a much publicized appeal, signed by himself and eleven colleagues, to the government, warning against the hydrogen project, but stating, that if this warning would be disregarded, the group would co-operate. Bethe's later participation in the development of the hydrogen project is therefore in line with his concept, with which one can disagree but which one must, it seems to the writer, respect.

P.M. wrote an open letter in very strong terms, in which he said that, if Bethe and Urey would not discontinue their work for the H-bomb, they would be inconsistent so-and-so's. That Bethe is uncomfortably consistent did not bother P.M. P.M.'s personal views, his futile attempts to convince somebody by calling him names could be passed over as P.M.'s way of thinking. But he used a meeting at which no member of the S.S.R.S. and only three or four visitors were present to get permission to send this letter out as an official message of the New York chapter. Any organization standing for such procedure would be doomed. The S.S.R.S. did not — and is living and growing healthily, in spite of P.M.'s withdrawal.

His reference to the Annual Meeting also boomerangs. On P.M.'s suggestion his friend was made feature editor of the *Newsletter* of the S.S.R.S., because P.M. and his friend claimed that a big amount of important papers would be available. During his tenure this "feature editor" did not submit a single article, news item or even letter to the chairman of the education division, who is responsible for the production of the *Newsletter*. Letters sent to him were returned "addressee left; new



address unknown". May one take that as an impressive illustration of P.M.'s "co-operation".

## REPLY, by P.M.

The rejoinder of Dr. Paschkis to my final services over the S.S.R.S. is printed above. I wish to offer my apologies to him for the long delay in replying, something not very graceful in view of the fact that he did take the pains to rejoin, which indicates a responsibility to opponents not so common as it should be. It is the simple fact, for which I offer no further apology, that this reply was long delayed solely because of the press of other work.

The question seems to be: is the S.S.R.S. alive or dead? Dr. Paschkis stoutly claims that it lives on and thrives. Well, even a corpse "lives on and thrives" in the form of grubs, bacteria, plants, and their potential nutrient substances — its *elements* persist, in short. Our interest in the S.S.R.S. was however not based on the presence of its *elements*, by which I mean the small number of persons motivated by established pacifist convictions who now compose it. They had these before the organization of the Society, keep on in them now, and doubtless will continue them beyond the formal end of the Society up to the moment when the official world cuts off such luxuries — the one absolutely excluded thing being that they can make these views prevail over the official ones. The subsistence of that Society which now "lives on" adds very little to the separate existence of these elements. There is the press, the *Newsletter*: mutual exhortations and protestations of faith, plus an extraordinary degree of preoccupation with the formal minutiae — meetings and their arrangements, minutes (though nothing is really said), reports (though nothing has really been done) and the like. There are also occasional meetings, social coherence on a regional basis, and a certain amount of rather crepuscular organized activity of the "committee" type. Well, isn't that already "something"? Yes, it is certainly "something"; an unqualified obstacle to all progress toward just the Society's avowed objectives. To get the feel of this fact you would only have to sweat through a few meetings, as I did, where one could see forming in the minds of interested outsiders the thought: "So these pious piddlers are the ones who are going to give us 'constructive alternatives to militarism'!" This sort of organism must either live or die, it cannot remain indefinitely in the process of birth. If the ideas and procedures that could make something out of it do not prevail and bring it to birth, those other "ideas and procedures" which have, in fact, won out, entrench themselves and provide a zealous, experienced, *organized* resistance to any hopeful new attempts.

It is not the subsistence of a formal organizational structure which decides life or death, it is whether the given group shows the tiniest glimmer of readiness to carry out seriously and with adequate means *its own declared aims*. This group says it is for "social responsibility in science", "constructive alternatives to militarism", and what does it actually do? Remember that for protest or for espousal, there is so much to do that, as Paschkis says, "a selection is obviously necessary". Paschkis, as often, is his own best parody and reply, for he is oblivious to the irony when he parades his small list before us:

"In addition to increasingly successful work in bringing the ideas of the S.S.R.S. before the scientific community, work on constructive alternatives is growing apace. Present activities in this field include consultation for agencies working in the field of rehabilitation, development of small tools, suitable for use in underdeveloped countries: plans for study and training of technical people from other countries are in the stage of development."

It is certainly obvious that a "selection" has been made. On the one side the finest, grandest, most ornamental generalized ideas and principles (which here fulfil only the function of *advertising*) espoused in the abstract, on the other a content of practical activities so pathetic, so little imaginative, so *respectable* . . . What has happened is apparent. The "selection" of tasks is an adaptation to the environment like that of certain animals which, unable to dominate in any major sector, seek out the crannies and crevices in the ecological setup, the places where they will be secure from larger competitors, an adaptation in which the official environment has imposed itself on the organism far more than the latter "selected" any tasks. The whole world, meantime, so far as at all affected by technical specialities, lies before this group of scientists and begs for the *serious* formulation of "constructive alternatives to militarism". But they find nothing better to do, in the above-listed activities, than make a tiny, belated echo of a limited and officially *passé* phase of government propaganda (this makes them *very* respectable), the Point Four Program. The Society also recently proposed to lobby directly for Point Four, though even for such an activity "It was felt that the S.S.R.S. lacked the resources and numerical membership required . . ."

Now, however desirable it is in itself that the under-developed countries receive technical and material aid, the Society's approach to the matter robs its advocacy of all positive value — provides it a negative one, in fact. What in this field would be a *serious* attempt toward a constructive alternative? To formulate technically realistic and *adequate* plans for the economic improvement of under-developed countries. Whatever the artificial social obstacles to their realization, such plans would stand in everyone's awareness as a concrete picture of what is possible, and as such have great authority and value. But to do this, the first necessary thing would be to dispel the fiction that America with Point Four was making a serious attempt to build up these countries, and not, as the Society by its approach is now doing, fudge the actual fact that Point Four in material effects (let alone propaganda aspects, really the main point . . . the trap is just for "liberals" of the S.S.R.S. kind) was only a very small-scale adjunct to a limited and one-sided form of construction, the sort which is needed in colonial areas more efficiently to exploit their raw materials. To regard Point Four as "constructive" without further qualification, to abet and echo it without recognition of this fiction, is very much like saying to the owner of a dilapidated warehouse stored with valuable goods, merely that the new ramps and timbers which a thief has installed better to make way with the goods, are "constructive" and improve the warehouse. It is fatal to limit one's constructive plans to the officially suggested level of marginal improvements. Plans not only for "small tools", but also for a lot of "big" ones as well are required in all areas: in irrigation, health, industrializa-

tion and power-generation, in roads, in machinery and chemicals for agriculture — *adequate to the real possibilities*. To talk of alternatives, yet *not* undertake these, makes one the servant of official policy which *lyingly* declares that only this tiny economic aid to these countries is feasible, when in truth vastly more is fully possible. The plea of "lack of forces" does not justify the failure to undertake such plans: at least the *need* must be recognized, and pilot plans in specific areas are not beyond the forces even of a small number of trained people.

Most of the Society people are very well-intentioned and "only want to help". Yet, there are lies of commission and lies of omission, and sometimes the latter are worse than the former. The positive liar at least knows the truth, and it is likely to slip through nonetheless in some fashion. His mendacity does not have the insidiousness of bland good intentions, that do not know, or *do not let themselves know*, what is required for a true and adequate action. It is a *cliché* that political complexes with a reactionary net product, are amalgams of scoundrels (who supply the direction) on the one side, and fools on the other. The latter are not mere appendages, they have a role to play, and the more kindly, moral, good-doing people they are the better they play it! In this instance, officialdom occupies the former role, and the Society (with others) the latter. By the mere failure quite to understand what is required, to see that while one kind of constructive alternative or plan is infinitely valuable, another is infinitely worse than useless, the Society has made itself part of a highly efficient division of propagandistic labor, one which perpetuates the reactionary official views with an effectiveness that the whole apparatus of a Goebbels would find it hard to match. It fools itself, fools others, and *prevents* the correct approach to the objectives from arising.

I have now made this as plain as I well can, where it was not obvious on the surface. It is enough. I do not intend to return to the subject or the Society, the price of paper and ink being what it is. There remains only to answer for the sake of the record, the more important of Paschkis' detailed points.

The one matter he mentions which has at least a little justice is the one about the annual meeting and the feature-editorship of the *Newsletter*. I promoted this job in the heat of the moment. It was a mistake, I realize now. I naïvely hoped that the apparent agreement with the resolution would mean that some co-operation could be expected in efforts of the sort suggested above. Of course, what happened was that we got nothing from the Society regulars, and all the load fell on one or two people. Naturally, this was not completely accidental or unplanned. It is part of the times that certain common political practices have poisoned the air and that especially people with great "reverence" toward democratic forms absorb and use (on the active side) or remain unaware of (on the passive) the techniques of reigning bureaucracy. The "ideas and methods" of preserving the *status quo*, routine and stagnation, have consciously or unconsciously been embedded in experience, tempered and organized. The reception of our resolution by the Society leaders involved a common "maneuver" — if something compounded so largely of elemental inertia can be dignified by that name. Scrupulous observance of the *spirit* of democratic procedure would demand that any course of action, once endorsed in a resolution,

should be tested by everybody within the limits of his capacity. Bureaucracy, however, knows how to use the "maneuver" of the Big Backside. A minority proposes something, arouses sympathy for it, and the leaders answer: "So, you suggest this new course. Well, we don't agree with you, and don't know what you're driving at (they know very well!), but we wish to be fair. We'll give you a chance to try it out and convince us. We appoint you a committee of one to undertake your scheme." Then they are very careful to withhold practical co-operation of any kind, sit tight, pretend that nothing is going on. In the bigger and less tenuous organizations, they can do other things too, such as shift potential sympathizers of the minority out of town for "technical" reasons, load the minority people down with work, undertake a whispering campaign to isolate them. Well, we were trapped by this trick in all its cleverness. It is obvious that the sort of endeavor suggested is ambitious and effort-consuming; and it did not in the circumstances prove possible for two people to undertake it in such a way as to produce "a big amount of important papers". Paschkis is wrong, though, in saying that nothing was submitted. I wrote a letter at about the same time as the Bethe letter suggesting that the Society undertake to support as a "constructive alternative", and where possible to elaborate locally, the plan of Norbert Wiener and Giorgio de Santillana for urban decentralization as a protection against atomic warfare. No one paid any attention. This doubtless did not constitute "a big amount of papers". Yet it did answer in principle the question put to us when we offered our resolution: "You propose a certain type of action. Let us see a practical example of it," and as for *importance* (one of the ingredients demanded by Paschkis), it has sufficient inherent importance to have reconstituted the Society and changed its basic orientation, *if only it had been followed out seriously*. Why it was not is the whole burden of comments on the Society printed in this magazine.

I am not relying solely on my own opinion in stating its importance. It is interesting that the Society has recently been moved to consider it once again, if in a somewhat vaguer form. This may throw a little light on the concerted silence on the previous occasion, though I prefer to think what is just as likely (knowing the Society's low metabolic rate and uncertain internal communications) that the people concerned simply did not "notice" what was involved earlier, and that now it has just occurred to them. In a recent *Newsletter* William T. Scott and John Swomley suggest, as a major project, "preparation of a pacifist alternative to the civilian defense proposals of Project Lincoln". If they think this out a little farther, they will find that the only worthwhile alternative in this direction is some variant of a decentralization proposal such as the Wiener plan. Believe me, I haven't the least malice. If I were really convinced the Society were now going to carry out this project consistently, for that matter if it only prepared itself to do *anything* seriously and consistently, I should gladly admit my mistaken evaluation of it, would humbly help and co-operate, would even paschkis Paschkis, if necessary. This seemingly reckless, foolhardy promise, how safe it is! If Scott and Swomley go ahead seriously with their idea, they will encounter no other response than my past letter did.

Paschkis in the above note is demonstrative about his reverence for

democratic forms, and formal consistency generally. See where it leads him on the matter of the Bethe letter. Here more than anywhere else is the man his own parody; does he know *what he is saying*? On the basis of Bethe's *formal* consistency with himself, established by sticking to inconsistent *material* premises set up in advance, Paschkis would condemn my criticism of Bethe! Bethe *knows* from his hydrogen bomb article that a war conducted with hydrogen bombs can only break down the democracy which it is supposed to be preserving, but he binds himself in advance to go ahead with it anyway! And I am lectured for attacking his *consistency*! Sufficient on that point.

Again. Paschkis condemns my procedure as an undemocratic one in issuing a letter in the name of the local Society without first consulting other members, and declares that any organization which would stand for such procedure "would go to pieces". But he is unable (you can hardly count the above effort) to find anything in the *content* of the letter with which he can disagree, for it is fully in accord with the Society's declared principles. In these conditions, the question of whether I was speaking for members, sympathizers, or only for myself becomes entirely second-rate. They signify that not I, but the Society's leaders were behaving undemocratically, for by their action they show that they do *not* stand literally and unambiguously for their principles, declared fully and openly and thus shared with all. On the contrary what they do stand for is their own private, wilful, undeclared, minority interpretation and adulteration of the principles. They *talk about* "social responsibility", but the moment one takes them literally and attacks Bethe for his monstrous *irresponsibility*, the false-front-for-advertising use of such a phrase becomes apparent. The actual content of their objections on "tone" is a clique tie, unquestionably the same one that unites all polite gentlemen and proper professional people, with those other scientists who (doubtless impelled by weighty reasons of conscience) positively espouse war. An organization that does not stand behind its own principles and presumably demands for any action, other than mechanical repetition of articles of the creed, a total referendum, shows its true nature. This last is a nice illustration of what the much traded-on hyper-scrupulous observance of democratic form really means. In practice it reduces the organization to paralysis except at national meetings, and even there tends to make the "proclamations" and "appeals" which are appropriate to such occasions a trifle vague, lest anyone of the assembled should look too deep into his conscience and find he could not go along.

They say it is good style to end on the note with which one began. Here it is natural, because I never got very far away from it. What is visible in this piece of haggling about procedure, as in all other phases of the Society, is that this organization is not alive. Certainly it is in no danger of "going to pieces". The "pieces" never got assembled into a functioning organism in the first place.

Carmel, 20th November, 1953.

## MATERIAL and DOCUMENTS

*Eisenhower's State of the Union Message*AMERICA ON THE ROAD OF  
HITLER AND STALIN\*

THE SECOND WORLD WAR ended with the unconditional victory of the Allies. To the average citizen, deluded by official war propaganda as to the true nature of the Russian slave-state, this signified the victory of liberty over fascism. By a great popular effort during the war, the American people had broken the totalitarian system, and assured its own right to live in freedom — or so everyone thought.

With the war's end, the political atmosphere began changing rapidly. The cold war providing the general background, a series of repressive measures, growing more and more inclusive in effect, was enacted by vote of Congress, by Presidential executive order, and by various States and localities all over the country. "Loyalty" investigations of Federal government employees were begun, only to be followed by similar investigations of students applying for Federal scholarships, of workers in plants with Federal government contracts, of teachers in public schools of State government employees. Oaths of loyalty were forcibly extracted from college professors, from barbers applying for state licenses, from tenants in federally-subsidized housing, even from attendants at municipal lavatories. The political beliefs of tens of millions of American citizens had come under the surveillance of Federal and local police. One began to wonder: Had the war resulted only in the importation of the methods of the totalitarian state into America?

Any doubts on this score were greatly weakened by the emergence into national prominence of a bi-partisan group of Senators and Congressmen whose sole legislative purpose seemed to be the maintenance and development of a reign of terror. McCarran, Velde, Jenner, Nixon became leaders of a Congressional drive, supported by both Democrats and Republicans, to legislatively alienate one inalienable right after another. Finally, McCarthy added to the whole process the unmistakable stench of Hitler and Goebbels. In the whole Congress of the United States, not one resolute defender of the precious constitutional liberties of the American people could be found.

As against the "tough" position of the fascist bloc in Congress, the executive administrations under Truman and under Eisenhower took up a pose of "mildness". "Why indulge in McCarthy's crudities?" they said again and again. "Leave the matter to us. By the calm, the 'objective' methods of the FBI, we will accomplish the same things with due protection for the rights of everybody." How the destruction of liberty was to be accomplished with due protection for the rights of everybody was left unexplained. However, we are saved the effort to understand this paradox

\* This leaflet was recently issued by the Movement for a Democracy of Content in the United States.



by Eisenhower's State of the Union Message of January 7th, which explodes the whole deception into the air.

In his speech, Eisenhower went far beyond even the most extreme proposals put forward by Congress, proposing that persons convicted of "conspiring to advocate the overthrow of this Government by force or violence" be deprived of all their democratic, constitutional, and inalienable rights as citizens, by being deprived of the fundamental right to citizenship itself. Now, what "conspiring to advocate the overthrow of this Government by force or violence" means in a situation where the President of the United States stands before its Congress and openly advocates the use of the force of the Government bureaucracy and the violence of the Federal police for flagrantly and obviously unconstitutional ends is by no means clear. For a clarification of Eisenhower's meaning we can only turn to the *New York Times*, in which we find his speech headlined, "End Citizenship of Subversives". But exactly who is a subversive and who is not? This question might be easier to answer if a number of Senators and Congressmen had not been engaged, for some months in finding a law which would subvert the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution without openly repealing it. It might be easier to tell subversives from Republicans if the Attorney General had not advocated the subversion of constitutional guarantees against search without warrant by supporting legalized wiretapping. It might be easier to say that the Democratic Party were not a subversive un-American conspiracy if Democratic Senator McCarran had not lent his name to a law importing into America that most foreign, un-American, subversive and intolerable institution, the concentration camp — several of which already have been prepared in the United States under the McCarran Act.

What then does Eisenhower's request mean? It means that the totalitarian monopolists who control the American government have at last decided that the time for half-measures is past, and have decided to bring the lash out into the open to insure, by application of force and violence, that the increasingly restive American people learn that the citizen's first duty is — to obey.

Indeed, Eisenhower has the most weighty of reasons for doubting his subjects' obedience. For some time now, all the major signs have indicated that an economic crisis of serious proportions is building up. It is officially admitted that three and one-half million persons will be unemployed by the end of 1954. How well this official prediction is likely to correspond to the true situation at the end of 1954 may be ascertained from an inspection of the current Department of Commerce figures on unemployment. These statistics give the official number of unemployed as 1,800,000. But, at the same time, they state that the number of persons employed fell approximately two million in the course of 1953. Since over one million persons were unemployed at the start of 1953, there are actually between three and three and one-half million unemployed right now. In view of these figures, it is easy to take the prediction of Professor Colin Clark of Oxford, a conservative Australian economist, that there will be seven million unemployed in the U.S. by the end of 1954 as more correct than the official prediction.

General Eisenhower is quite right in thinking that the obedience of these unemployed, and of the whole American people in the depression that is beginning to paralyze the economy, will not come up to the best military

standards. Like any other general, he seeks to provide in advance for the effects of this insubordination by courts-martial and drumhead death-penalties. In the civilian language to be found in law books, this means that to loss of job and imprisonment, which are now insufficient as threats, Eisenhower adds loss of citizenship, permanent police surveillance, permanent custody as dangerous to State Security, and (soon to follow) imprisonment in concentration camps.

How would the Eisenhower plan work? Inciting resistance to oppression would become treason, punishable by loss of citizenship. But non-citizens, in the words of the *New York Times*, "cannot own or inherit property, practice law, receive liquor licenses, hold any kind of public employment, or work for private concerns that receive public contracts. They cannot receive passports for travel abroad or serve on juries . . . they have to register with the government, be fingerprinted, and keep the government continually advised of their address". The *Times* neglects to add that non-citizens have in fact no right, since, at the pleasure of the Government, they can be arrested as dangerous to the state, and confined indefinitely. The absolute brutality with which the Federal authorities execute these fascist statutes may be seen with revolting clarity in the case of the pitiful cabinet maker, Ignatz Mezei, who, for the crime of visiting his aged mother in Hungary, has been condemned to indefinite imprisonment on Ellis Island.

Foreseeing a depression in the immediate future, the Administration seeks to deprive the American people of its ability to protect itself by obliterating all democratic rights, and replacing liberty by the rule of bureaucrat and policeman. By taking repressive steps in time, the Administration hopes to direct the pressures of the coming crisis away from itself, and to use the pressures to bring about the complete totalitarianization of American life. Eisenhower's speech signals the beginning of a great campaign to force down the political and economic standards of American life, and to subject all classes in society to the untrammelled will of the great monopolists and their police-military tools. Eisenhower himself has openly called for an attack on the social position of the farmer, whose independent existence is a constant impediment to the complete domination of giant industry. After the farmer, it will be the turn of labor and of small business to feel the iron fist of monopoly expropriation. In the last analysis, no class will escape the wild fury of the forces of totalitarianism, which, if not stopped in time, will surely destroy civilization and human life itself.

Does this seem far-fetched in 1954? Who, then, would have believed seven or eight years ago that a monstrous purge atmosphere would exist to-day? Who would have believed only three years ago that McCarthy's line would become the official practice of the Administration? And what will be the atmosphere in the United States five or ten years from now? Where and with whom will the list of victims end? The full impact of totalitarianism was not felt in Germany and Russia for many years after Hitler and Stalin came to power, and the precedents for totalitarianism are being established in the United States with a rapidity that is startling when viewed from 1949 and 1950. America has been turned into a courthouse reminiscent of the notorious Moscow Trials; purges in government, professions and factories recall the purges of Hitler and Stalin; licensing by

"Loyalty Oath" of vocation after vocation brings to mind the complete regimentation of life in Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia. When Eisenhower asks that native-born "subversives" be deprived of citizenship, he borrows neither more nor less from the Nazi citizenship law of the 'Thirties which deprived all German oppositionists to Hitler of their citizenship. When the Town Council of Lakewood, New Jersey, enacts a law calling for the registration, finger-printing and photographing of all workers over 18 years within 24 hours after reaching Lakewood, and when these workers are required to carry police identification cards at all times or face fine and imprisonment, this Town Council borrows precisely from the internal passport system in Russia. If these laws are not enacted or executed at once, the fact remains that they have been introduced. The public is being "acclimated" to the "issue" — and, once presented, all opposition is adapting itself to these laws and is debating the extent to which they will be applicable and enforced. The level falls back step by step, month by month, year by year. Likewise, when a President of the United States — whose traditional responsibility it is to "check" and "balance" the extravagances of Senators and Congressmen — promotes and even outdoes the wildest extravagances of Congress, then liberty is already far gone and the "excesses" of McCarthy are no longer mere episodes and incidents. They are now official policy, "dignified" by the Executive Power and executed by the Federal police. The Constitution and Bill of Rights is flagrantly regarded as a burden to be removed, as a legal technicality to be circumvented by clever verbiage. It is only a matter of time when the last pretenses of American Constitutional liberties will simply be amended out of existence . . . in a perfectly Constitutional, legal and "democratic" manner. And all of this will be done to "protect democracy" from its "worst enemies"! The American people will be "protected" from totalitarianism by totalitarianism, slavery by slavery, censorship by censorship, concentration camps by concentration camps. What supreme, unconscionable cynicism!

*Uncompromising* resistance to all the illegal and unconstitutional plans of Eisenhower and his following of fascist Democrats and Republicans is the *only* way out. To Eisenhower we must say: Not any miserable horde of Stalinist wretches, but you and your cabinet are the principal threats to the well-being and security of the American people! For one who would subvert American liberty, one need not look further than McCarthy, whose clear aim is to remake America after the Russian pattern. For persons dangerous to the national security it is not necessary to seek out others than McCarran, Velde, Jenner and Nixon, who use their positions of power to prepare the enslavement of American society. For treachery in high office, no more perfect example can be found than that of Eisenhower, who, sworn to defend the democratic rights of the American people, seeks only to cancel and deny them.

The wild cheering which greeted Eisenhower's fascist proposal in the House of Representatives and the bills introduced to enact them into law shows that the hour is late. Only by an immediate, determined and principled struggle against the passage of totalitarian legislation can we save ourselves from the unenviable fate of the Italian, German and Russian peoples. The flabby and shameful retreat of all the organizations of official

liberalism makes it imperative that the struggle be made through fresh channels, unpolluted by the slime of a thousand secret betrayals. As a minimum program for the salvation of the most essential democratic rights and the reaffirmation of the most precious constitutional liberties, we must demand: Rejection by Congress of Eisenhower's subversive plot against the right of citizenship! Rejection of the unconstitutional and illegal schemes for wiretapping! Rejection of the Brownell scheme for subversion of the fifth amendment! Repeal of the anti-democratic Smith Act! Repeal of the totalitarian McCarran internal security and immigration acts! An end to the investigation of state and federal employees and to all loyalty oaths!

Write to Eisenhower and to your Congressmen protesting against all existing and proposed legislation against our liberties!

January, 1954.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIALIST STUDENTS'  
ORGANISATION.

The Secretary's Office,  
Kumasi, Gold Coast, B.W.A.  
7th September, 1953.

Dear Sir,

I have been advised by the Organising Committee of the National Association of the Socialist Students Organisation to acknowledge receipt of the twenty-five sets of books you have so kindly sent to us and to register the Association's appreciation and thanks to you for so great a present.

The Committee wishes to help spread your doctrine and it has therefore sent some of the books to other progressive Organisations in the country and they equally send to you many thanks.

The Contemporary books form the nucleus of the NASSO library in Kumasi and generations shall always remember your contributions towards the building of a Socialist Gold Coast.

Yours Fraternally,  
F. B. Asare,  
Organizing Secretary.

.  
.  
l  
t  
o  
n  
e  
y  
n  
s  
r.





## BACK NUMBERS OF CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

contain, amongst others, the following articles:

The Great Utopia—Plan for the organization of a World Democratic Movement	(No. 5)
Germany and World Development	Ernst Zander (No. 1)
War As A Way Out ?	Ernst Zander (No. 7)
War as the Main Obstacle — Reply to Fischer	E. V. Swart (No. 8)
State Capitalism in Russia	M. S. Shiloh (No. 7)
South Africa's Trek From Progress	David Kemp (No. 3)
British Development and the Common Illusion	Geoffrey Quilter (No. 2)
The Cold War and the Hydrogen Bomb	Ray Jackson (No. 9)
Occupied Japan: The Policy of Annihilation in the Far East	David Kemp (No. 10)
A Social Study of Genocide	M. S. Shiloh (No. 10)
Persian Oil: America Defeats Britain	Andrew Maxwell (No. 11)
Crime and Competition in America	Thomas Cranmer (No. 11)
Interim Balance Sheet: The Bankruptcy of Power Politics	Ernst Zander (No. 4)
America's Garrison Economy	Nathan Davidson (No. 11)
The Problem of Chemicals in Food	L. Herber (No. 12)
The Crisis of Europe	Joseph Ramai (No. 12)
India: Destruction through Partition	A. E. Ross (No. 14)
The Use of the "Lie Detector": An open letter to Senator Wayne Morse	Chambers McAdory (No. 14)
Appeal for an English Edition of Diderot's "Jack the Fatalist"	Wilhelm Lunen (No. 15)
The Farm Glut	G. Troiano (No. 15)
The Fate of American Civil Liberties	Harry Ludd (No. 16)
Kenya under the Iron Heel	A. E. Ross (No. 17)
The Book Business in America	Alan Dutscher (No. 17)

Obtainable from bookshops or direct from the publishers

## **CONTEMPORARY ISSUES can be obtained from:**

**Contemporary Press, 26 Heber Road, London, N.W.2**

Wm. Dawson & Sons Ltd., Cannon House, Macklin Street, London, W.C.2

B. F. Stevens & Brown Ltd., 28-30 Little Russell Street, London, W.C.1

Edw. G. Allen & Son, 10-12-14 Grape Street, Shaftesbury Avenue, London, W.C.2

Gordon & Gotch Ltd., 75 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4

Bowes & Bowes Ltd., 172 Trinity Street, Cambridge

Weatherhead's, Market Square, Cambridge

B. H. Blackwell Ltd., 48-51 Broad Street, Oxford

F. & H. Beavis, The Market Bookstall, Swindon, Wilts.

John & Edward Bumpus Ltd., 477 Oxford Street, London, W.1

Messrs. Cranfields, Haverstock Hill, London, N.W.3

Haigh & Hochland, Oxford Road (nr. the University), Manchester

Humanitas Books Ltd., 3 Goodwin's Court, St. Martin's Lane, London, W.C.2

Leicester Square Bookshops, 28a Leicester Square, London, W.C.

News Store, 10 Coptic Street, London, W.C.1

W. H. Smith & Son Ltd., Book Dept., Strand House, Portugal Street, London, W.C.2

## **U.S.A. AND CANADA**

**Contemporary Press, 545 Fifth Avenue, N.Y.C. 17, New York**

## **ARGENTINA**

Mitchell's English Book Store, Cangallo 570, Buenos Aires

## **BELGIUM**

Librairie du Nord, Bd. Adolphe Max 163, Bruxelles

## **EIRE**

Eason & Son Ltd., 79-82 Middle Abbey Street, Dublin

Dublin Wholesale News Agency, 74 Middle Abbey Street, Dublin

Burns, Oates & Washbourne Ltd., 21-22 D'Olier Street, Dublin

## **FINLAND**

Akateeminen Kirjakauppa, Helsinki

## **FRANCE**

Galignani, 224 Rue de Rivoli, Paris 1er

Messageries Dawson, 4 Faubourg Poissonniere, Paris Xeme

La Concorde, 240 Rue de Rivoli, Paris 1er

## **GERMANY**

Gerhard Hänsel, Köln-Kalk, Vietorstr., 16/18

## **HOLLAND**

Meulenhoff & Co. N.V., Beulingstraat 2-4, Amsterdam-C.

N.V. Martinus Nijhoff's Boekhandel, Lange Voorhout 9, 's-Gravenhage

## **INDIA**

Bhawnani & Sons, Connaught Place, New Delhi

## **NORWAY**

I. W. Cappelen, Kirkegt. 15, Oslo

Commermeyers Boghandel, Karl Johansgt., 41 & 43, Oslo

## **SOUTH AFRICA**

Contemporary Press, P.O. Box 13, Johannesburg

Central News Agency, Commissioner Street, Johannesburg, and all branches

## **SWEDEN**

A/B Sandbergs Bokhandel, Sturgatan, 8, Stockholm

C. E. Fritze, Fredsgatan, 2, Stockholm

## **AUSTRALIA**

E. F. G. Foreign Library, 28 Martin Place, Sydney, N.S.W.

University Bookshop, Hackett Hall, Crawley, W.A.

---

Published by Contemporary Press, 26 Heber Road, London, N.W.2, and

Printed by Kenion Press Ltd., 216 High Street, Slough, Bucks.

